Mohammad Hatta
Portrait of a Patriot

NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE

THOMAS J. BATA LIBRARY
TRENT UNIVERSITY

19.50

Portrait of a Patriot

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/portraitofpatrio0000hatt

Portrait of a Patriot

selected writings by

Mohammad Hatta

Mouton Publishers · The Hague · Paris

Chapters 1, 5, 26-37 translated from the Indonesian, *Kumpulan Karangan*
Vols. I, II and IV, 1953-1954.
Chapters 2-4, 6-25, 38-43 translated from the Dutch, *Verspreide Geschriften*, 1952.

© MOUTON & CO, 1972

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 71-171098
Printed in the Netherlands

Foreword

Mohammad Hatta, the writer of the articles collected in this book, is a patriot. He loves his country and is ready to defend it zealously. This has been manifest throughout his lifetime, from his early student days on. His patriotism has several times landed him in serious difficulties, from prison detention to exile, and indeed endangered his very life.

Born in Bukittinggi, the center of the Minangkabau in Sumatra, on August 12, 1902, Hatta, when still a junior high school student, came in direct contact with Sjech Djamil Djambek of Bukittinggi and Hadji Abdullah Ahmad of Padang, both modernist *ulamas*, who acted as teachers and advisers to aspiring intellectuals of the area in the 1910's and 1920's. These *ulamas* did not only stress the importance of Islam and its compatibility with the modern age, but also impressed on people, and on young people in particular, the need for reforms in the social structure and economy of the country. They saw the backwardness and, in many parts of the country, the downright wretchedness of their fellow countrymen, which they regarded as a major obstacle to progress. They considered it their duty to uplift the people and to make efforts to eliminate the pauperism. The *ulamas*' concern over these matters was prompted not only by their humanitarian feelings, but also by the commands of Islam.

Hatta's family background was also deeply religious. Both his grandfather and his father were in their time great *ulamas*, albeit with traditionalist ideas. Their students came from various parts of Indonesia, including Kalimantan and Sulawesi, to spend a number of years at the *surau* (religious center) in Batu Hampar, about 15 kilometers from Bukittinggi.

Hatta himself is very religious. He is one of the comparatively few western-trained leaders in Indonesia who from childhood on have been well-known for their devotion and their attachment to

245788

Islam. This is manifested in his public as well as his private life. He regularly performs the daily prayers and observes strict fasting in the month of Ramadhan; his friends praise him for his moral virtues and integrity. In 1932 his arrest by the Dutch authorities was made just after he had finished the *subuh* (morning) prayer.

Because of this religious background as well as his attitude toward religion, Hatta has always been at home within Muslim groups, whether traditionalist or modernist. As a leader of the Jong Sumatranen Bond (Union of Young Sumatrans), he was close to Hadji Abdullah Ahmad, the union's adviser. When studying in Holland, he was a regular 'foreign' correspondent of *Bintang Islam* (The Star of Islam), a journal issued by leaders of Partai Sarikat Islam Indonesia (Indonesian Muslim Association Party) and Muhammadijah in 1923. During his exile in Banda Neira in the thirties he continued to contribute articles to various journals of the Muslim groups, such as *Pedoman Masjarakat* of Medan (under the editorship of the well-known *ulama* Hamka) and the Muhammadijah journal *Adil* of Solo. During the Japanese occupation he was even requested by the late Kijahi Hadji Abdul Wahid Hasjim of the Nahdlatul Ulama (Renaissance of Ulama) to take over the leadership of this traditionalist organization, which he politely declined on the grounds that leadership of an organization should come out of the rank and file itself. But he expressed his willingness to discuss the problems of the Nahdlatul Ulama with Wahid Hasjim and other N.U. leaders. In his later years, i.e. in 1967, Hatta and a group of younger Muslims were ready – after preparations extending over 3 or 4 years – to launch Gerakan Demokrasi Islam Indonesia (Indonesian Muslim Democratic Movement), which was intended to be a forerunner of a new Muslim party, but a ban by the Suharto government made realization of the plan impossible.

Hatta's devotion to the Islamic cause is also reflected in his sermons for Friday prayers on several occasions. He demands from his fellow-Muslims purity of heart and mind, confident in his belief that in all the arduous tasks of life – gaining a livelihood, reforming the social and economic structure of the country – complete integrity can be maintained. He has often said that all of a Muslim's activities should be *li Allah* (for the sake of Allah), expecting neither reward nor any other compensation, whether in this world or the life hereafter.

It is perhaps because of this attitude that Hatta has always thrown

himself seriously into his multifarious activities. He never joined an organization just for fun. Whether in the youth movement or in the national movement, he devoted his attention and energy wholeheartedly to the cause. Indonesia's grand old man, Hadji Agus Salim, once said about Hatta's activities for the nationalist cause during the latter's student years in the Netherlands, that Hatta's involvement in the movement was like his attachment to religion.

Perhaps it is also because of this religious influence or that of his *ulama* father, that he has all his life been a dedicated student. He has always loved the quest for knowledge, filling whatever spare time he has with reading. His high seriousness of purpose as well as his concern for the search for knowledge are reflected in the various articles in this compilation. The depth and width of the articles unmistakably stamp the writer as a scholar.

Unlike many other Muslim leaders, Hatta has not labored just for the benefit of his own religious group. Hatta's endeavours have never been limited to his fellow Muslims but have included other religious groups as well. In this sense he is truly a nationalist. He loves his country and he loves his fellow countrymen. He considers it his duty to be of service to people irrespective of their religious persuasions.

This does not mean, however, that his attitude toward people from foreign countries, including colonial powers, is inimical. He shared, and still shares, the feelings of other oppressed peoples in the world, as his activities at the various international congresses in Europe during his student years have shown, not least at the first congress of the League against Colonial Oppression. Here, at the 1927 Brussels congress, he struck up an acquaintance with Jawaharlal Nehru, from which a very close friendship grew.

Hatta may be said to have abhorred colonialism, to have abhorred the policy of the Dutch government in Indonesia during the colonial period, but not the colonizing nations as such, including the Dutch.

It is thus understandable that, in defending his country, Hatta has not been filled with hatred and ill-feelings toward the Dutch. One of the many wise counsels he has given his followers is always to remain calm even when feelings run high.

Hatta's love for his fellow countrymen has been manifested in his advocacy of socialism as the basis for the country's economic advancement. It should be remembered that when he was still a student at the senior commercial school (Prins Hendrik School) in

Djakarta in the late 1910's, socialist ideas began to infiltrate the nationalist movement, especially the rank and file of Sarikat Islam. Alongside of issues like the Indies Resilience (1917), the November Promise (1918) and the Tjimareme Affair (1919), the debate on socialism was then very much in the air. The Indische Sociaal Democratische Vereeniging (Indies Social Democratic Union) under two Dutchmen, Baars and Sneevliet, influenced Sarikat Islam local leaders like Semaun, Darsono and Alimin to such an extent that eventually the biggest people's party, Sarikat Islam, split. This development did not go unnoticed by active and nationally conscious youth leaders like Mohammad Hatta.

But Hatta's views of socialism were not affected by the ideas of Baars and Sneevliet or any other communist leaders. Indeed, Hatta has never been in sympathy with Communism; his religious and democratic convictions constitute a bulwark against this ideology.

Three sources have contributed toward Hatta's socialist ideas: the Islam, Indonesia's traditional collectivism and Western democratic socialism.

As regards the relationship between the Islam and socialism, he said in one of his speeches in Bukittinggi that is is essential 'for us Muslims who are obedient to Allah, that socialism should be reared on the basis of our own religious conviction'. Hatta has in fact often been called a religious socialist.

According to Hatta, Indonesia's traditional collectivism is expressed in *gotong rojong* (mutual cooperation) and *asas kekeluargaan* (familial relationship). He sees the nation as one big family, every member helping the others for their mutual benefit. But it should be added at once that this nation does not need a kind of patriarch, since its structure should be based on democratic principles.

The third source for Hatta's socialist ideas is democratic socialism. In this connection Hatta often refers to the successful activities of the Fabian society in England and the cooperative movement in the Scandinavian countries. Hatta's view is that, if in a capitalist environment like the West successful attempts can be made along the road to socialism, the wretched poverty and underdog condition of the Indonesian people during the colonial period as well as after independence should most certainly provide a breeding ground for socialism.

According to Hatta the realization of socialism in Indonesia can be accelerated through the growth of the cooperative movement.

It will not only constitute a bulwark against capitalism, but also be instrumental in forming personalities with a good character, i.e., people who know themselves and have faith in themselves, who develop auto-activity, who are loyal to friends and who practise mutual assistance. Cooperatives promote solidarity and repulse unfair competition.

Hatta's ideas on socialism in general and cooperatives in particular have been incorporated in article 33 of the Indonesian Constitution, which reads:

1. The national economy shall be organized on a cooperative basis.
2. Means of production of importance to the State, and vitally affecting the life of the people, shall be controlled by the State.
3. Land and water and the natural resources contained therein shall be controlled by the State and used for the maximum prosperity of the people.

Hatta was the architect of this article; he has indeed been recognized as the Father of Cooperatives in Indonesia.

This Indonesian leader also sees in the cooperative societies a means for inculcating democratic ideas. His declared faith in democracy ever since he first joined the independence movement did not grow from his confrontation with the undemocratic Dutch administration in Indonesia, but from his views on man's position within a nation. He would not have agreed to a change of rule over the country from the Dutch to Indonesians, if this had meant a return to feudalism (what he calls 'feudal nationalism'). Nor would he favor the taking over of the country by intellectuals alone ('intellectual nationalism'). He says that nationalism should be based on democracy, by which he means that major decisions are to be taken by the people at large through deliberations by their representatives.

Hatta's convictions on this point have been made manifest all through the Dutch, Japanese and independence periods. He worked out his ideas on democracy in 'Free Indonesia', the manifesto of his party, Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia (Indonesian National Education), in 1932. He was one of the few Indonesian leaders in the late thirties who warned the populace against Japan's imperialist ambitions, not only because imperialism was in conflict with the goals of nationalism but also because of the fascist nature of the Japanese at that time. During the debates on the drafting of the 1945 Constitution toward the end of the Japanese occupation, he was one of the few members of the Committee for the Preparation

of Independence who fought for the inclusion of at least a few of the basic human rights. When he was vice-president (1946-1956, except for eight months in 1949/1950 when he was Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Indonesia) he always disciplined himself to comply with the stipulations of the various constitutions, often to the disappointment of those of his supporters who wanted to see him more active and decisive in influencing the course of affairs. When between 1959 and 1965 he saw that political developments were taking a less and less democratic turn, and it even seemed possible that democracy might be completely eliminated from the country, he democratically warned the government as well as the people against this deviating course. 'Our Democracy' (1960), written first as an article in *Pandji Masjarakat* (The Banner of Society) and afterwards published as a brochure, was his most important writing on this problem and was eagerly read by many. It is worth noting that after the brochure had been banned by the government, many copies were still circulated in secret.

Hatta believes that democracy cannot be built by force, whether from above or below. That is why he, as Vice President, did not want to impose his ideas on others; rather, he laid stress on persuasion in the hope that other people who at first did not share his opinion might do so later on. Often, however, Hatta's sympathisers themselves were not patient enough for this method of their leader. They saw the ruthless development toward dictatorship after 1958, and only Hatta, they thought, would be able to put an end to it.

As an ordinary citizen, i.e. after his resignation from the vice-presidency, he never advocated the use of force either. During the last six or seven years of the Sukarno regime he often had to calm down people who were disappointed with the way things were going and who came to see him in Djakarta and elsewhere for advice. He soothed them, told them to be steadfast and patient, and warned against a possible split of the nation of they resorted to force. The younger people who contacted him during this period he advised to prepare for the post-Sukarno era. He was actually convinced then that Sukarno's rule and his policies could not go on unchecked for any considerable length of time.

It would have been easy for this man of high caliber to take a different standpoint, if he had wanted to. His supporters included people from every walk of life, within as well as outside the government. But he was also convinced, as always, that democratic ideas should not be thrust upon the people by undemocratic means.

It is worth noting that he adopted this attitude in spite of attempts by the government to deprive him of every contact with his sympathizers. The work of a vice-president certainly demanded from Hatta much energy and time, yet he still found time to give lectures at Gadjah Mada University in Jogjakarta and the Army Command and Staff College in Bandung. After his resignation from the vice-presidency he continued to give these lectures on a more regular basis. However, about 1960 he had to give up teaching at both institutions. No proper reason was given; apparently he was *persona non grata* at the time. He remained more or less in isolation until after the attempted Communist coup in 1965.

Looked at from another angle, Hatta has been more of an educator than a politician. He wanted to educate people, not only through theoretical ideas and in their thinking, but also in practice. He set examples in matters relating to people's attitudes toward others, toward society and toward the state. He seems not to care about power at all, although at one time or another in the past opportunities for seizing power virtually thrust themselves upon him. He dismissed the temptation because of his awareness that the unity of the nation and the country which he has helped to build up and strengthen throughout the greater part of his life should be maintained above everything else.

Since the abortive Communist coup in 1965 Hatta has become more and more an elder statesman to his nation rather than a politician. Not the least important aspect of his involvement in efforts to found a Muslim Democratic Movement is that it set an example to others of how a democratic leader and a democratic movement should act and behave. He was originally inclined to remain in the background, leaving the conduct of the movement to the younger group. It was only at the insistence of these young people that he agreed to take over the leadership of the movement. But when President Suharto expressed disagreement with the founding of the movement and thus prohibited it, Hatta readily complied with the government decision. He advised the younger people of the movement to do likewise, while at the same time exhorting them to abide conscientiously by its principles. He indeed respects the government, his own government, in spite of certain disagreements; he respects it within proper limits.

He once rejected with regret a government request to sit on Dewan Pertimbangan Agung (Supreme Advisory Council) on the grounds that he considered it better to continue to serve the coun-

try and its people as an ordinary citizen. In 1970, however, he complied with a government request to act as adviser to President Suharto and to serve on a four-man committee for advising the President on anti-corruption. He completed the assignment in due course, made whatever suggestions he thought best for the President to carry out and withdrew again into the background.

If Hatta is considered more of an educator than a politician, albeit a political educator, would the predicate 'patriot' still fit a man like him? There is not necessarily a discrepancy between these two predicates. Hatta's movement in the colonial period, Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia, clearly showed that a politician can also be an educator. His attitudes and activities from his early days to his present age drive one to the conclusion that he has always been a patriot, but with an educator's mind.

This is Mohammad Hatta, the patriot, the democrat, the socialist, the scholar and the Muslim. He is now an elder statesman, sometimes considered rather awesome but always respected by friends and foes alike.

This book sets forth Hatta's opinions and ideas in his own writings as published in various forms – articles, brochures, papers – or prepared originally for speeches, from 1923 to 1970. Not all his writings can be included, but selections have been made on the principle of giving a sound and representative picture of this founder of modern Indonesia.

Djakarta, May 1, 1972 Deliar Noer

Contents

Foreword 5

1. Indonesia in the middle of the Asian revolution 17
2. Drainage 27
3. The economic world structure and the conflict of power 36
4. Some main features of the world economy 58
5. The objectives and policy of the national movement in Indonesia 103
6. Propaganda 144
7. The Brussels Congress against Imperialism and Colonial Oppression and our foreign propaganda 158
8. Indonesia and her independence problem 165
9. The Anti-Colonial Congress in Brussels in the light of world history 185
10. A retrospective account of the Second Congress of the League against Imperialism and for National Independence held in Frankfurt 200
11. 'Indonesia free' 205
12. National claims 298
13. The growth of the P.N.I. and government terrorism in Indonesia 321
14. The crisis of the P.P.P.K.I. 333
15. Non-cooperation 340
16. The political meaning of non-cooperation 352

17. The Second International and the oppressed peoples 358
18. The colonial resolution of the Second International 361
19. Indonesia's demand for immediate independence 373
20. The Digoel tragedy of Dutch colonial imperialism 377
21. Three years of the Digoel scandal 382
22. Governor-General De Graeff and the Indonesian freedom movement 386
23. The organised terror against the national movement in Indonesia 397
24. The raid on the Partai Nasional Indonesia 402
25. The destruction of the P.N.I. 407
26. Youth in crisis 412
27. The verdict of the District Court of Bandung 422
28. Colonial policy 429
29. The fight for the freedom of the press 434
30. The principles of the Hitler dictatorship in Germany 440
31. The inheritance of Versailles 449
32. '14th July' 457
33. Becoming the ideological war 462
34. The French Revolution 470
35. Fascism and paradox 480
36. On character 485
37. Message to the Chinese Group Conference 494
38. Indonesian aims and ideals 501
39. A personal message to my old comrades wherever they may be 504
40. On the road to transfer of sovereignty 507
41. End of the Round Table Conference 515

42. Legend and reality surrounding the proclamation of 17th August 518

43. Message to the All-Indonesian Christian Youth Association 529

44. The cooperative movement as an institution for teaching autoactivity and a high economic character 535

45. Indonesia's foreign policy 547

46. Indonesia between the power blocs 559

47. Colonialism and the danger of war 570

48. One Indonesian view of the Malaysia issue 576

49. Asian countries in the changing world 582

50. Islam, knowledge and society 593

1 Indonesia in the middle of the Asian revolution

Das problem der Freiheit wird von neuem lebendig, es wird zum Problem der Entwicklung und der höchsten Fragen: der Forderende kann nicht mehr mit überlegenem Sittlichkeitsbewusztsein von der Schwelle gewiesen werden; die Beweiskraft der Weltanschauung und Praxis lastet auf dem Bevorrechteten und Bevorzugten.

Walther Rathenau (*Von kommenden Dingen*)

Anyone who stops awhile before the gates of the Twentieth Century, listening to the call of the waves that beat and break on the shores of the Indonesian Archipelago, and feels the thrill of the wind blowing and carrying with it the seeds of new thoughts all over the islands that girdle the Equator, will become aware that in the East there is rising the dawn of humanity, accompanied by the splendour of the sun rising, with its golden rays illuminating a few islands governed by a Mikado. Was it not from there, from the islands of the Japanese, that there first arose the idea of the freedom of Asian nations after centuries during which their lands had been surrendered to the white man? Since the year 1854 the Japanese have been subject to the provisions of the 'Treaty Powers', as has been the case with China. In a short time she will be able to free herself from the 'gorilla grip' of the great empires.

The political and economic development of this country, especially after the year 1890, has roused the anxiety of the United States of America and Europe. After her conquest of China in 1895 she found she was able to sit side by side with the other large countries of the world. It was at that time that in the western continents we heard the rumour, which was launched by Kaiser Wilhelm, that it was necessary to pay attention to the peril which was coming from the East, the Yellow Peril which was going to overthrow Western politics. At the same time, the great White Bear which stretched near the North Pole, was showing signs of fright. The gates of his

lair in Siberia have always been beset by ice and snow. That is why he felt he needed to possess a good harbour situated within the territory of China. But the Japanese have beaten him to it. At the peace negotiations with China at Shimonoseki, the Japanese received as the fruits of their victory the island of Formosa and the Liaotung peninsula. But with the help of the French and the Germans, the Russians were able to snatch away from her most of the profits of her victory: the Liaotung peninsula and Port Arthur, which was the most beautiful harbour in the area.

When the Germans joined with the Russians in applying the pressure which forced the Japanese to renounce their territorial claims in China, on the pretext that the Japanese occupation of that area would always constitute a serious threat to the capital of China, this was only done for ulterior motives. The main objective was to become attractive to China and to get on friendly terms with her so as to bring about greater progress in trade with that country. In order to achieve this they would certainly at some stage or other want to occupy a part of the territory of China which could serve as a base where they could start their trading. But the great question was, how was this to come about. But sooner or later a cause was bound to arise. And in fact it did. Two German missionaries were murdered in China, and as compensations for their deaths, the Germans demanded that they be granted a lease of the Kiaochow territory.

On the other hand, when the French joined with Russia in order to force the Japanese to leave the Liaotung peninsula, the basic idea behind this collusion was to ensure that Japan should never become a powerful empire, because if this did come about, it would certainly constitute a threat to France's colony in Cochin China.

However, British policy in Asia was different from that of both the Germans and the French! Her policy in the continent of Asia was always diametrically opposed to Russian policy. In Persia and Afghanistan the British wished to be able to exert political and economic influence, and the same could also be said for the Russian Empire. In this area it is petroleum which has become the main object of dispute. In a like manner, is was observed that the two empires were pursuing opposing policies in China. The British have already planted their power throughout the entire Yangtse region,[1] which is richly endowed with iron and coal,[2] whilst Russia is gradually coming downwards from Siberia and is starting exerting her influence in Manchuria. As soon as Russia had succeeded in snatch-

ing the Liaotung Peninsula from the Japanese, the British cried out that the balance of power in the Straits of Pe-chih-li had been upset. For this reason they regarded themselves as empowered and justified in occupying Wei-hai-wei so that the balance of power could be restored. There is a Malay proverb which says: 'The strutting rooster picks up all the corn and none is left for the flock.'

All these political struggles of these large countries, usually known as the *Batailles des Concessions* have at all times inflicted losses on China because the stronger and wider the influence of foreigners in the country, the stronger were the political and economic bonds which they forged.

Whilst in Asia the British were constantly measuring up to the Russians, the progress made by the Germans, especially since the year 1872, resulted in an increase in English domination. That is why it is not a surprising fact that the English did all they could to make friends with the Japanese. This was a way in which they could muster together all the force they could in the North Sea for the purpose of protecting their own country and for fighting the Germans, if hostilities should break out between the two countries. While this was going on, their possessions in Asia could be defended by the Japanese. In the year 1898 the British achieved their objective and in this way an alliance was founded between Britain and Japan. In the first chapter of the Treaty which they drew up, each of these powers defined its own interests. What is more important is the second chapter, which contains a declaration to the effect that if one of these countries should be fighting against another country in defence of its interests, the ally would not interfere. On the other hand, it was to be the duty of the ally to keep guard to ensure that no other country helped its ally's enemies.[3] The British recognised at this time that the Japanese possessed interests in Korea. It was this alliance which paved the way for the Japanese to take revenge against Russia, because if that country had chosen to fight it would have had to stand alone. From that time onwards the Japanese were able to concentrate on building up their weapons of war. In 1904 the right time finally arrived for the Japanese to take their revenge for which they had waited so long. The twentieth century had only just been ushered in when the blast of gunfire in Chusima announced to the world that the rights which were supposed to be generally held by the white man in Asia were no longer holding good. The great White Bear was so badly beaten by the Japanese, that he hung his head in shame and

returned the former Japanese possessions. The victory of the Japanese over the Russians constituted a great shock to the world. In Asia, it meant that man had started to move at last. The tail end of the defeat of Russia was an armed revolt within the country itself, and the fire from this revolt hotted up the political sphere throughout the entire continent of Asia. From that moment onwards, the evolution which was taking place in Asia changed into revolution. There was a tremendous upsurge of joy among patriots throughout the continents of Asia, especially in India. Did not the French philosopher Renée Grousset say: 'In no other country of Asia was such an enthusiasm unleashed by the defeat suffered by the Russians, not because they were Russians, but because they were Europeans, and the victory of the Japanese, not because they were allies of England, but because they were Asiatic'.[4]

The nationalist movement in India, which was first formed at the Great Rally in Bombay in 1885 with Bannerjee as the leader, stated its fresh aims. Up to the year 1900 this movement was moving peacefully towards *Swaraj*.[5] In addition to this *Swaraj* there also appeared once again a movement called *Swadeshi*, which was aiming at economic independence for the Indian nation.[6] Every event which has taken place since 1905, the year of the Japanese victory that caused such joy in the East, the Russian revolution which set a new example in regard to how one should fight governments, all these have strengthened the left wing of the people's movement. Moreover, it is true that Lord Curzon initiated a policy of 'divide and rule'. He became the Governor-General and he was in power between 1898 and 1905. What he did was to divide the Bengal region into two parts, one of them being handed over to the Muslims. The intention behind all this was quite definitely to create clashes between Hindus and Muslims, so that the British could stay longer in India. Even though this policy did result in causing hostility between the Hindus and the Muslims, on the other hand it added fresh fuel to the flame of the people's movement in India. At the big Rally in Surate in 1907, Bal Gangadhar Tilak declared that the desire of the Indian nation was nothing more or less than genuine freedom. Was it not this leader who wrote in his daily paper: 'that for every nation there is no other way of achieving freedom than revolution. The police and a small number of soldiers will not be able to withstand the flood of revolution'.

Some events which took place in Russia, such as bomb-throwing at ministers, were also repeated in India. In November 1909 Gov-

ernor Lord Minto was welcomed in Ahmedabad with a bomb and a similar experience befell Lord Hardinge in December 1912. Hundreds of killings brought about in this way took place but it is not necessary to go into that here.

When the god of war unleashed the dogs of war on Europe in 1914 and engulfed all creatures in a torrent of blood the people of India remained loyal to the British, even though the time was ripe for them to resist and achieve their independence. The stab in the back was not in character for the Indian nation, who have lofty and chivalrous ideals. The National Rally and the All-Moslem League agreed to help the British Empire with money and moral support; in the hope that the British would know how to reward them. In France and Belgium, in Mesopotamia and Palestine, Hindus and Moslems shed their blood to save the dignity of the British Empire. Only the power of the Hindus and Moslems enabled the British to gain power over the Arab countries and Iraq.

When over the grave of Mars, the war-god, was heard the voice of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, reading the funeral prayers and there were planned the rights of self-determination (the right of every nation to determine its own destiny) which flourished throughout the world, reminding the Indian nation that the new voice of the 20th Century is none other than the word *Swaraj*, which had been proclaimed by them thirty years before, they remembered the promise made by the British in the Great War, that India would gain her own government as a dominion. The Indians thought that part of their ideal would be accomplished. But were they right in supposing that the British would keep their promise and reward them? Far from it. Not only did India not get independence, but the constitution which had formerly been called 'The Defence of India Act' was converted into 'Rowlatt's Bill' declaring the supremacy of the Army. In the Legislative Council the delegates of the nation criticised this action, asking that the constitution be withdrawn, both outside the Council and at general meetings, but the British Government turned a deaf ear. Moreover their Field-Marshal Dyer who led the Army in India, showed his real nature when he gave the order to shoot 1800 bullets into a rally in Amritsar (13th April 1919) which was attended by about six thousand people who came there to listen to the speeches of their leaders. Three hundred and seventy-nine died and there were one thousand two hundred casualties. Instead of being punished this 'brave' hero received the highest praise.

From that moment it was obvious to the Indians that their ideal of freedom could not be attained with help from outside, especially from the ruling nation. They realised that their noble ideal would have to be achieved by their own efforts.[7] It was also obvious to the Indians that, given unity, they could destroy the great edifice of British power, which was based on the policy of *Divide et impera*. Here lay the greatness of Mahatma Gandhi, the only man who was able to unite Hindus and Moslems who all this time, thanks to British intrigues, were constantly at loggerheads with each other. The solidarity of the two groups of people became so strong that the Hindus entered the Moslems' mosques and the Moslems entered the Hindu temples.[8] The rally in Amritsar, where the tragedy of December 1919 took place, resulted in India's establishing ties with Persia, Turkey and Egypt. 'It is better to die than remain part of an empire stained with blood' said Rajpat Rai.

Although national leaders such as Muhammad Ali and Sjankat Ali, Rajpat Rai and Mahatma Gandhi were seized and put in prison, the *Pan-Indianism* movement which was guided by the ideal of *Swaraj* did not decrease in strength. This movement worked like a volcanic crater, and when the time came it exploded and out came the lava, flowing down and obliterating every fence and ditch constituted by British imperialism which constantly barred the way to India's liberation.

The movement of the Indian nation was then followed by another Asian national movement born in Asia Minor in the centre of the Anatolian mountains and led by a national hero, a soldier diplomat by the name of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. He was a hero because he had fought in the Great War and had defeated the enemy several times and it was he who made the Entente retreat and withdraw the attack on the Dardanelles, when they were about to enter the city where the residence of the Caliph was. He was a diplomat, for ever since his talk in Sivas in 1919 he had been able by his ingenuity to consolidate the national movement and unite all forces in Turkey to recover their losses. In the centre of Asia Minor reappeared a tremendous resurgence of the *Pan-Islamic* Movement which extended to Pan-Turanism[9] and turned into Pan-Asianism.

The British Empire, which should have been grateful to the Moslems of India for helping to save its prestige, has forgotten the good services rendered and has become the enemy of Islam. The supposition made by the Moslems of India that after the war the British would defend the Islamic countries, especially Turkey, proved to

be entirely wrong. When the British had won the war they became dictatorial in their attitude. Their old desire to convert Constantinople into a place like Gibraltar soon made a very clear reappearance. Even though Wilson had said that Turkey should remain independent, Lloyd George, the fighter of Albion, regarded himself as the Pope and assumed that he was born to continue the work of Pope Urbanus II who at the end of the eleventh century had started a campaign to re-conquer Jerusalem from the Turks. In the year 1919 he began a modern crusade, stating that it was his intention to deliver the Armenians from the oppression of the Turks. But if we could have seen inside his heart we would have seen that his main intention was a different one, because Lloyd George's belief bore no resemblance to that of the Pope, but he practised the religion of 'economics' and he worshipped the god Mercury. His ambition was none other than to deprive Turkey of her economic treasures, particularly petroleum. Turkey was not to remain in Europe, and when she returned to Asia, all her places were to be occupied by whites and the capital on which she earned her living was to be taken away.[10] Greece was to become the executioner to act for Lloyd George, and she was given sufficient arms to enable her to stab 'the sick man of Europe' to death. If Turkey had disappeared as a country, there was no doubt whatever that the British would occupy Constantinople, their general aim being to acquire an even shorter route to India through the region of Anatolia and Mesopotamia.[11] However, Turkey, which up to now had been regarded as a sick man lying on his deathbed, recovered, guided by the 'will of the nation' situated in Ankara. When one has the will as strong as that to achieve the noblest ideals, it is not possible for it to be put down by force of arms. A lady journalist, Mrs. Berthe Georges-Gaulis, who saw the movement with her own eyes when she was passing through Anatolia, predicted that the Turks would conquer because the national movement was based on a noble ideal and because those who were leading the movement really worked without expecting any reward, because they were fired with the true interest.[12] These words, which were uttered in 1921, were proved to be true a year later when the Greek army was defeated by Mustafa Kemal Pasha and was scattered in Afium Karahissar[13] on the 26th August 1922. The whole of Europe was taken by surprise when they heard the news. Moreover, when several weeks later they were told that the Turks were about to gather in the Dardanelles, even the land of Albion was shocked to the core. This show-

ed up the defeat of the British very clearly. Their aim of occupying Constantinople was of no avail and they were forced to approve the desire of the Turks to go back into Europe. The success of the Turks in their armed fight was ended by diplomacy in Lausanne, under the guidance of General Ismet Pasha. It was none other than Lloyd George himself who had to ratify the success of the Turks.[14] He was truly annoyed and deeply upset.

The success of the Turks was a very meaningful development in the eyes of the Asian nations. It was regarded as the conquest by Asia over the continent of Europe, and after that time there was born the Pan-Asiatic movement, under the mantle of Islam.

The flame of nationalism in Asia was still burning, and the Asian Revolution had still not yet ended. Throughout the entire region of Indonesia the flame of nationalism was also burning brightly. Anyone who pauses for a moment and thinks of the position of these islands in the continent of Asia, in the midst of countries which have been striving towards their independence, will understand that nothing can prevent Asia reaching her destiny.

The gunfire in Chusima awoke the people of Indonesia and told them that the sun was already high in the sky, forcing the Indonesian people to join with other nations in their headlong rush along the route to progress and independence. The seeds sown by Mahatma Gandhi on the left and on the right of the Ganges not only grew there, but at least half of them were blown by the wind towards the Equator and were received in welcome by the mountains passing along the Indonesian Archipelago, where the seeds took root. Soon afterwards they grew. The gunsmoke of Afiun Karahissar was blown towards the East until it covered Indonesia and caused a rain of dust containing the seeds of humanity. Here, too, the people began to move in their quest for freedom, freedom which had been stolen from them for such a long time. It is necessary for us to remind the young people of Indonesia of these facts. It is necessary for them to know that any noble ideal can be achieved provided there is a powerful unity based on the will and the strength of the nation.

To end these remarks, let me urge you to draw your examples from past times and to remember that in their movements which are struggling for right and freedom, the Asian nations must be fully aware of their own God-given talents, because this realisation alone will ensure that in the end they will reach complete success.

First published in *Gedenkboek Indonesische Vereniging*, 1923.

1. Achille Vialate, *L'impérialisme économique,* p. 158.
2. See also: W. J. Luccardi, *Rond de Stille Zuidzee,* pp. 37, 43.
3. If either Great Britain or Japan, in the defence of their respective interest as above described, should become involved in war with another Power, the other High Contracting Party will maintain a strict neutrality and use its effort to prevent others from joining in hostilities against its ally.
4. *La Revue Nouvelle,* no. 7, July 1923, p. 25.
5. See: D. M. G. Koch, *Herleving,* pp. 187-238.
6. Albert Métin, *L'Inde d'aujourd'hui,* p. 239.
7. Anyone who read in the newspapers the statement by Ramsay MacDonald on the 6th January 1924 to the people of India will come to the conclusion that the glorious aim of freedom can only be achieved by our own power and by employing our own initiative. For many years this leader of the Labour Party promised to help the Indian movement and always pleaded with the Indians to have patience. But when he became Prime Minister of perfidious Albion he broke the word he had given. The Indians are distressed that what he is saying now runs counter to what he had promised previously. The same may be said of Ireland. If she had been waiting for the help of the British Labour Party, she is still without home rule up to the present day and is still classed as a dominion. World history has shown that help given from the ruling side always weakens the freedom movement and can deflect it from its course.
8. A. F. Brockway, *India and its Government,* p. 10. See also René Grousset, 'Les nouveaux aspects du problème indien', *Revue Nouvelle,* p. 28.
9. The reader who wishes to know details of Panturanianism led by Enver Pasha should see: Berthe Georges-Gaulis, *Angora, Constantinople, Londres,* pp. 237, 238, 254; Lothrop Stoddard, *The New World of Islam* (Introduction).
10. *L'Europe Nouvelle,* no. 42, November 14, 1920: 'L'accord tripartite relatif à l'Anatolie', pp. 1689-1692.
    Did not Francesso Nitti in his book *Het verval van Europa* state on p. 119: 'But agreements were made between the belligerent states of Europe to take over all the resources of Turkey: Great Britain was to get Mesopotamia and Palestine in the form of mandates, France was to get Syria and Sicily, Italy was to move into Anatolia, that is to say the most arid part of Turkish territory and would also get control of the *vilajet* Smyrna. The ruling men in Italy considered two stupid ventures: the concession of Smyrna and a military expedition to Georgia two fatal adventures which would have brought Italy into direct war with the Turkish powers on the one hand and the Bolshevist powers on the other. They would have meant for Italy economic ruin on the one hand and the certainty of a military undertaking of incalculable difficulty which would have demanded all the resources of the country at the precise moment when Italy required them most of all for her own reconstruction.
    When the Italian delegation to Paris left the Conference in connection with the well-known Fiume incidents, President Wilson no longer wanted Smyrna to be granted to Italy but to Greece. Italy, which does not have many reasons to be grateful to President Wilson, should always be thankful to him for this act of friendly antipathy. Without this action Italy would have been thrown into the precipice of a war which was just as lacking in righteousness as it was wild and bloody'.
11. The reader will be aware of the importance of the railway in Anatolia which became the cause of hostilities between the great powers of Europe. See the book: E. M. Early, *Turkey, the Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway.*

12. Berthe Georges-Gaulis, *Le nationalisme turc,* p. 141.
13. The reader who wishes to know something of the details of the genocidal processes at Afiun Karahissar should see: Berthe Georges-Gaulis, *La nouvelle Turquie,* pp. 54-91.
14. See his book: *Is it peace?* pp. 254-266.

2 Drainage

In *Hindia Poetra* no. 3 there was an article 'The New Advance' which spoke of the *disintegration* of our society. In connection with this we shall try here to discuss the drainage system which is one of the principal causes of this disintegration.

Let us travel back in thought to the early period of the sixteenth century, then we shall see how the Indonesian Kingdoms in the time of their greatest blossoming maintained an intensive commercial trade with the nations round the Persian Gulf, India and Further India, China and Japan, and in this way also formed the links between East and West. Indonesia, situated between three continents and two oceans, is still today pre-ordained to take up an important position in the centre of world trade which is moving more and more towards the east.

The arrival of the Hindus in Indonesia had a beneficial influence on cultural life, whilst contact with the Arabs, who brought Islam with them, resulted in the democratisation of our social life and the spread of trade with the peoples of the Red Sea. These contacts were favourable factors for the economic prosperity of Indonesia. But towards the end of the fifteenth century of the Christian era there began the invasion of the white race, at the beginning with 'peaceful' commercial aims, but gradually during the centuries which followed, demoralised by their god Mercury, they began to wield dominion in that area. It is known how the contact with the Westerners led not only to the destruction of Indonesian trade, but also to the mutilation of the social structure. Its own economic development was stopped! The internal weakness of Indonesian society which had already set in and the policy applied to it of 'divide and rule' had assured the Westerners of constantly increasing influence in the political and economic field. The golden age of Indonesia was over and done with for good; the time of decay had set in. It was not difficult then for the Dutch to make the

preparations for the later grandiose set-up system of colonial exploitation. The changeover from trading area to state territory, the change from private ownership to state ownership was only the intensification of the exploitation of the tropical wealth exalted to a closely interlocked system. The riches which had for the most part been acquired by force were moved towards the west without a sufficient equivalent being given in return. The profit motive could find no more favourable application than in the economic El Dorado of Indonesia. 'The experience of the past and of today is that this fixed rule (i.e. to buy at the lowest prices and sell at the highest prices) applied by a superior power of economy and force to agricultural tropical peoples leads to their maximum exploitation and national mutilation'.[1]

The establishment of the East India Company was the opening up of the period of colonial drainage. 'The natives produced, the Company bought, or rather *seized*[2] the products'.[3]

We have thus reached the era of 'modern' civilization, the colonial machine moves onwards inexorably, only now new oil must be used: one tries to cover up the rougher form of open exploitation by rational justification so as to soothe one's conscience. 'Drainage'? asks the colonial exploiter; 'drainage does not exist. On the contrary! we give the land back enriched, thanks to our activity and our care bestowed upon it'. Naively and all too quickly Mr. Putman Cramer thus cries triumphantly:[4] 'The "drainage" of the Netherlands Indies by foreign capital belongs to the slogans which have so frequently been hurled against that capital during the last few years. Just like many slogans it is in essence absolutely unjust. Drainage of the national wealth should take place when that capital took the wealth which belonged to the Indies and carried them away. Of drainage in the case of the crops one should only speak when the crops exhausted the country and wholely or partly took away the fertility thereof, thereby getting to a greater or lesser degree confused in the terms economic and physical. Naturally everyone knows that when one talks from our side about drainage one always means drainage in the purely economic sense. Moreover, we do not rest in the first place on the point of view that the national wealth is drained, but that *that* part of the product produced by co-operation between the land, work and capital, which belongs to Indonesia, is carried away from there and assigned to Holland's capital. It is *too* paradoxical to claim that the distribution of the income is justified when capital receives the lion's share. For was it

not von Wieser who said that 'no means of production, even the most effective, brings the yield alone; it always requires the assistance of others'.[5] When Mr. Putman Cramer claims that the fertility of the soil only has a relative value, basing himself on the statement of Mr. Gonggrijp that the wealth of a country resides in the first place in the peoples who live there or can be brought there, in their labour and their economic performances and somewhere says again that one could only talk of drainage of the national *income* if that income without the co-operation of the foreign employer and the foreign capital would be greater than now, after deduction of the part which flows away elsewhere in the form of dividends, then he naturally forgets to say that also the capital, in the event of the lack of co-operation of the Indonesian ground and the labour of the Indonesian workers would have lain without interest or could only have been placed against a very low rate of interest, as a consequence of the increased supply and a proportionately small demand. *Also the yield of the capital has a relative value*!

The assertion that in Indonesia no capital-forming takes place, that the cultivated wealth goes out of it and that consequently the drainage takes place, stands firm as a pole out of water. But let us trace how the drainage is put into effect.

In the case of the agrarian/industrial production in Indonesia the factors which co-operate are land (the Indonesian capital), labour and European capital as complementary goods, the size of the proportion of each in the coming into being of the end product can be determined theoretically, starting off from the teaching of the attribution of value. For 'the sum of all productive contributions exhausts precisely the value of the total yield'.[6] Where the economic subject in the satisfaction of his needs always – all things being equal – strives towards the levelling of the limit benefit of these needs, the value of the land, the labour and the capital used complementarily will be valued at the limit value of the end product, which among the end products to whose production they have served, has the smallest marginal usefulness. Thus, for example, the price of sugar, being the result of the subjective evaluations of the buyers and sellers who still meet together on a basis of barter, will determine the size of the joint contribution of rent, wages and interest of the European capital. The sizes of the portions of the yield which must be allocated to each of the three productive factors cannot of course be expressed mathematically by the very nature of things, in view of the fact that exact data regarding same

are absolutely unobtainable. The theoretical investigation only needs to be able to trace how far the allocation in practice, as it is carried out in Java between the three parties, of which two (peasants and workers) cannot assert their economic requirements to the full, is justified. Previously the remark that of the three factors the Dutch capital – but bear it in mind that we are talking here with regard to agricultural Indonesia – is the most replaceable, whilst on the other hand the land is the most difficult to replace, seeing that without this the production of sugar-cane is unthinkable. It is of course true that the lack of the Dutch capital at the beginning would have brought about a quantitative and qualitative reduction in the sugar production, but one must not forget that in that case the Indonesian peasants would still have been able to devote their land to the cultivation of other crops, with which they are certainly more benefited than by giving out their lands on hire.[7]

In conjunction with the great demand for sugar and taking into consideration the position of Indonesia as the second sugar producer for the world market, the significance of the function of the land indispensable for sugar production must be very appreciable. Accordingly its limit value increases. Just in this connection the replaceability of Dutch capital invested in Indonesia should be greater, if investment were not identical with colonial domination. For the great demand for colonial products should go hand in hand with the mobility of capital for the financing of the crop. It is self-evident that in conjunction with the large supply, the interest falls. In the agricultural country of Indonesia the land is intended in the first place for the cultivation of the first necessities of life, in which case then its limit value is guided by that of the paddy yield. Since now the land had been taken away from rice-growing, applied to cane cultivation for the benefit of world consumption, the rent must nevertheless – apart from the increased limit value of the paddy – rise considerably, merely in view of the fact that its new limit value must be derived from the sugar product, to the production of which it fulfils an important function. In *Hindia Poetra* nos. 1 and 2 it was already expounded how greatly the land-lessors are disadvantaged so that it will be sufficient to refer to it here. It merely needs to be added that the rental must vary between the paddy-yield, as the extreme minimum limit, and the price of the sugar less the sum of the normal workers' wages, which must be equal to the discounted marginal product of the labour and the normal interest on the Dutch capital, the level of which is deter-

mined by the margins on the capital market, as a maximum limit. But the demon grasp of the Western system on Indonesian social life has contributed to the fact, as has already been expounded, many times in this periodical, that the land-lessors receive a rental far below the level to which they are entitled. The surplus is drained away through the Dutch investors, who in this way enjoy an increased unearned income.

In *Hindia Poetra* no. 2 page 23 it has already been pointed out that the Netherlands Indies Government proclaimed a so-called protection for the economically weak peasant landowners, i.e. the land rent order, which is based on an unnatural and therefore unreal foundation. The minimum value is measured according to the cash value of the paddy yield of one paddy field in the village, whilst rationally this must be deduced from the limit value of the product for the world market which is supplied by the Indonesian soil. When doing this, no account is taken of the essentially increased limit value of the land, the which increase is caused by the *demand* for the sugar product on the world market and thus *by the demand for land* and not, as is frequently wrongly asserted, that the increase occurs because of the use of Dutch capital. This use is the *consequence* of the demand for land.

The assertion by Mr. Putman Cramer that the crops do not exhaust the soil can be refuted by reference to the land lease order of 1918. The fact that it states inter alia in this order that when the leased land is given back to the peasant the sugar industry is required to *compensate* him, is eloquent proof that exhaustion has indeed taken place, at any rate in the sense that it has become less suitable for rice-growing, unless one spends a considerable amount on it.[8]

The draining off extends itself to the population living on these lands: *the exploitation of the labour force.* Production was not and is not oriented in the first place towards the needs of Indonesian society, but purely directed towards demand on the world market. When this production drive for the European market took place within the limits of legal moderation it could perhaps be spoken well of, since everyone in his economic dealings, by pursuing the economic motive, seeks to secure those goods which have the greatest marginal benefit. But the 'self interest', which has become synonymous with the 'race interest', of those in power did not refrain from overstepping the limits of legal moderation, thus exhausting the meagre remains of one of the declining native resources, and

social disintegration was the result. A self-sufficient Indonesia was turned into a land of poverty, or at least the Indonesian People, amidst the riches cultivated by the rulers and amidst its luxuriant natural surroundings, lives a miserable existence. The draining off, after the abandonment of the most criminal culture policy, is being pursued with the same intensity under the more liberal form of *printah haloes* – the 'soft drive' – brought to bear on the chiefs by well capitalised entrepreneurs in cooperation with the European government. The wages that are paid to the population are more *formalistically* equivalent in real terms: they are below the standard limit on the labour market. The Marxist theory of surplus value applies here completely: the price of labour is for the most part misappropriated by the European exploiter. This happens all the more easily because, as a result of dissociation, the unorganised peasant workers were totally powerless against this, while their standard of living is systematically being depressed. The organisations that are coming into being now can do much to temper maximal exploitation, but they cannot yet prevent the draining knife from cutting successfully with both edges.[9]

For more than two centuries Indonesia has had a continuously favourable trading balance, through which the draining off justifies itself. To be sure, the trading balance does not always normally express the true picture of the economic relationship between different countries, as the balance of payments does, which latter influences the rate of exchange and therefore in the final instance the imports and exports of a country, but if one compares the European capital invested in Indonesia with the export surplus which, according to balance of payments very largely expresses the price of the services of that capital, then one arrives at an unbelievably high interest, which in everyday language one would call usury. In a five year period, in the war and post war years, private loot amounted to more than in previous periods. 'The total export surplus in the years 1915-1920 can be estimated at 3.3 thousand million guilders, over 2 thousand millions of which represent sheer war profiteering, of which again a good 1¼ thousand million guilders can be attributed to sugar' – thus the German merchant Dr. Emil Helfferich who is very conversant with the Indonesian economy. Thus the Indonesian people can see how those fat surplus profits, earned from its own land and with its own labour force, are transferred to Holland, while the Netherlands Indies Government finds itself obliged to raise public loans, inter alia from the

V.S.A. at a very unfavourable rate – for which interest and repayment ultimately come from Indonesia – to defray the costs of 'colonial administration' and the maintenance of 'peace and good order' in the interests of the steady functioning of the draining-off machine. 'If outflowing foreign capital were taxed at the right time, the crisis payments from a forced loan would be covered; thus if simply what was immediately transferred to the motherland had been made available for Indonesia that infinitely rich country would never have known want. By this time however thousands of millions of Indies profit flowed out, treasures from the Indies soil grown with the underpaid labour force of the natives'.[10] But in spite of that, cries of woe were uttered by people who, over there in Indonesia, have caused a great deal of misery.[11]

But now we come into the regions of Higher or Colonial Politics and our task is only to take stock of the destructive consequences of the foreign administration in connection with a national economic reconstruction. But a coming article will deal with this!

First published in *Hindia Poetra*, no. 6. 1923.

1. J. E. Stokvis, *Van wingewest tot zelfbestuur*, p. 11.
2. My italics.
3. Dr. E. Helfferich, *Die Wirtschaft Niederländisch-Indiens im Weltkriege und heute*, p. 5.
4. *De Economist*, no. 3, 1923, p. 201.
5. F. Von Wieser, *Der natürliche Werth*, p. 70.
6. F. Von Wieser, *Der natürliche Werth*, p. 87.
7. This fact has been repeatedly suppressed by the colonial exploiters, who assert that the sugar industry is of great advantage to the native population, because it brings in a lot of money and thereby contributes to raising the standard of living. The sum paid in rent and the coolie's wage are taken together. And this is very nicely expressed in figures, to the effect that the circulation of money amongst the population has risen considerably, from which a psychological consequence is drawn that the population has become more prosperous. No more deceptive notion is possible than this, for what is regarded as increased prosperity is nothing more than an *apparent prosperity*. Without any scruples Mr. P. C. asserts in his article above-mentioned, that by 1920 the sugar industry alone was paying out 72.5 million guilders in wages for 'Native' work. Helfferich shows in his work already cited that more than one million natives worked on the plantations. At least $^{2}/_{3}$ of these however, worked on the sugar undertakings. So therefore one worker earned ± f 108/yr. or *nine guilders per month.* Mr. P. C. should be ashamed! An agricultural district must by its very nature be thinly populated, and there can be no question of a working class there. Where one in this stage is far less removed from the *Naturalwirtschaft* than in the industrial era, it goes without saying that in the agricultural community, and especially in

Indonesia, where mutual assistance is very pronounced, not much money is circulating. Nor is it necessary, seeing that everyone's income consists of goods in kind. The small amount of money owned by an agricultural people is only needed to buy industrial products of which it has need. The situation is different in an industrial community, where people are of necessity interdependent. Here prosperity depends on an intensive interchange of goods. The consequence of this is that one needs a great deal of the medium for exchange, i.e. money.

Hence it is quite stupid to judge prosperity by the size of the money circulation.

The sugar industry in Central and Eastern Java, like every other industry elsewhere, has brought to life a working class and a marked increase in population has been produced, which latter phenomenon is threatening Java even with over-population. 'High birth rates and misery are largely interacting causes. A high birth rate commonly means, in an old country, misery; and misery, in turn, often increases the birth rate. When a people is poor and sees no prospect of escape from poverty, it is in danger of becoming demoralized. Multiplication takes place without thought of the future, since the future seems in any case without hope. That very multiplication shuts the door to hope. In modern times, such a fatal round of interacting causes often appears in *manufacturing districts* (my italics) where there is much employment of women and children; as, for instance, in the textile districts in Saxony of which Chemnitz is the centre (in Java in the case of quinine, tea, sugar etc.). There women and children offer themselves for employment because people are many and wages are low. The very opportunity for securing employment, on the other hand, promotes multiplication, since the income of the family is eked out by the earnings of mother and offspring. Where such conditions have established themselves, the way of escape to something better is hard to find. The causes of demoralization and misery become cumulative'. Thus F. W. Taussig in his *Principles of Economics*, Part II, p. 220.

Even more fatal is the situation where a district such as Central and Eastern Java has a mixed agrarian and industrial character. The working class increases greatly and can no longer be supported by the district. Thus great poverty is to be seen as a byproduct of the sugar industry, in the midst of Java's luxuriant surroundings. The circulation of money brought into the districts cannot keep pace with the density of population. Thus usury becomes the practice.

8. § 6, par. 2 of the *Regulations* states: 'If the ground is hired for the plantation of a crop, as a result of which the lessor is caused considerably greater work when he receives back possession of the ground, then the minimum price is increased by a moderate amount of at most fifteen guilders per building for making good the drawbacks, for which purpose the ground, according to the condition thereof, is divided into categories, of necessity'.
9. Although in the above argument there is no mention of the entrepreneurs' profits (wages and risks) this does not mean that these are eliminated, since the general term 'Dutch capital' already includes these items. It has been done this way to contrast clearly the Indonesian and the European. The entrepreneurs' salaries and risks are already covered by the large premiums, amortizations and amounts placed in reserve. Even then it is still possible to pay out high dividends. Thus, for instance, in 1919-1921 the Landbouw-Maatschappij paid out 35%, 68% and 30%, the H.V.A. 50%, 60% and 25% respectively. But in 1920 the latter, for a capital of 20 millions, had more than 46.5 million running charges and nearly 28 million reserve

charges. Dr. Helfferich (*op. cit.*, p. 22) says the following regarding the abnormal profits: 'The 13 sugar mills and 14 other plantations of the H.V.A., which are each shown in the books at 1 guilder, that is 27 guilders in all, gave a profit of over *f* 31 million in 1919.' So this profit, reckoned on a capital of *f* 17.5 million is nearly 180%. The assets, each shown on the balance sheet as 1 guilder, give an indication that a hidden reserve has been formed, the amount of which must at least cover the value of these assets, so that these have now passed free of charge into ownership of the H.V.A.

10. J. E. Stokvis, *De Socialistische Gids*, 1921, p. 1117.
11. Here the argument is limited to the crops. Other industries also made fat profits. In 1920 the profits of the petroleum industry amounted to at least 300 million guilders.

3 The economic world structure and the conflict of power

Contrary to what has lately become traditional, that is, the new chairman of our society produces the foundations which will serve as directives of the society, I have decided to limit myself to a speech. The motives that have led me to this mainly lie in the fact that our principles are already so fixed that it seems superfluous to repeat it yet again this year. A speech has especially this advantage, that new points of view can be brought out that otherwise would have remained undiscussed if I had kept to the tradition. When choosing the subject of my speech I decided to restrict myself to a general discussion of the political situation of our fatherland; this will also include a justification of the points of view taken by our society. Of course many of you will only hear what is already familiar but all the same I have tried to see things in a new light in my speech. For those who are new to our society I hope I can be of some use. And thus for some time I ask for your attention for a contemplation of the *economic cosmos and the power conflict.*

One of the merits of the Greek philosopher Heraclitus is his pointing out of contradictions in society. Starting from a metaphysical philosophy he states that *all human beings are products of conflict.* When he says that struggle is the father of all things, he does not forget to add that all existing subsistences are products of opposites which attract or repel each other of which one unites and the other divides. Maybe the philosopher is not quite complete in the development of this thought but when we consider his suggestions fully we must come to the conclusion that, and in reality, these conflicts, in which in this dynamic world order the concept 'struggle' is implied are the cause of the formation of states, of the crumbling of worldwide empires into a number of smaller independent sovereign states, and last but not least the cause of subjection of the one state by the other. Thus conflict has shaped the world into what

it is nowadays. And no doubt they will give rise to other shapes in the future. An unbalanced distribution of power came about, which, on many occasions since the Westphalian Treaty of 1648, made it urgent to find a balance in Europe and to actually apply the system that had been termed 'the equality' of 'Christian' European states, at the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, which had the achievement of lasting peace in view. But this brilliantly radical invention ran aground on the facts of reality. New dynamic factors emerged from the balance, which created new conflicts of power. The result was bloody wars, which reached their zenith in the Napoleonic era.

Three years after the Congress of Vienna in 1815 the union of the Five Great Powers, an extension of the Holy Alliance, was formed as a stronghold of peace, which in the name of the so-called 'legitimation principle' would not only ensure the existing status quo, but would also preserve the internal peace of the state against revolutionary changes. However one should not imagine that the strong union of powers was in any way capable of stopping the workings of the law of conflicts. The legitimation principle is yet another example of a brilliant invention by diplomats; in fact it clashes with reality.

The urge for national freedom in the oppressed countries at that time could not be repressed by it. Then soon it was obvious that the Union of the Five Great Powers with their principle of legitimation was a failure. For there had never been so many wars as during the period of existence of this union. After no less than ten bloody wars both in and outside Europe during this time of its existence, its fate was sealed in 1848. The abstract 'legitimation principle' was replaced by the concrete nationality principle which had emerged from real situations and which had since become a burning problem in world politics. But not surprisingly considering its birth was accompanied by cause for war.

Although it is very tempting to deliver a survey of the major events in the history of international law, I must resist this as inefficient. I will restrict myself to pointing out that the entire development of political relations is the product of dynamic factors and conflicts of power.

When later Hegel developed his philosophy of comprehension according to the wellknown dialectic methods, then he too had to discover the theory of conflict. His dialectic philosophy could be summarised as follows: that all that is finite must, by virtue of its finiteness, change into something else. Then he tersely formulates

that the existence of conflict is the first requirement for development: without this it is not possible to make any progress.

When Karl Marx under the influence of Hegel's dialectic philosophy thought up his famous 'historical materialism', then the philosophy of conflict is obviously incorporated in every train of thought – the conflict which he wants to accentuate between the capitalist class and the proletariat. The class struggle as a part of this philosophy is a typical example of this conflict. I do not intend to digress on this any longer. The only thing I have in mind is to point out that a sharp thinker such as Marx also sees this conflict as a condition for the realisation of his political objective. And the secret of its success with the working class lies mainly in the fact that he clearly described the conflicts which exist in a human society.

Thus there are numerous thinkers in different times and of a different nature who are of the opinion that conflict, accompanied by its natural element struggle, ultimately determines the progress of society. In my opinion it is very important in the struggle for life to recognize these conflicts. This phenomenon every individual experiences in his normal daily life, whether consciously or unconsciously. The proverbial phrase 'struggle for life' does not only indicate struggle but also a conflict and especially the tension between – to use the phrase of Sombart – 'need' and 'resources'. Here too struggle is the necessary result of conflict and not the cause of it. Thus we can consider as the truth that *human society is ruled by the general law of conflict.* Without this no social community is possible. And every time it operates in a different atmosphere and in a different form, according to whether we are concerned with social, legal or economic phenomena.

If we then accept that conflicts are a decisive element in community life, then logically the following step is this question; which *factors* are the *cause* of this conflict in our society?

This is a question that cannot immediately be answered. In a short period of time I cannot give a vaguely elaborate answer let alone a complete answer. Moreover the empirical world shows numerous conflicts with their own characteristics so that it is not possible to classify them all together. For our purposes it suffices for me to expose the conflict which underlies the *colonial* situation and the *racial situation that is connected with it*: I mean the *antithesis* between *ruler and ruled.* The antithesis between the white and the coloured races. I am anticipating my final conclusion, when

I say that the colonial antithesis can only be solved by making the colonies independent. That the ruled show that they possess their own will, let them break this conflict by force and they will be free. There will be no freedom without force, because it is in the interest of the ruler for the colony to be retained at all costs. One look at world history will prove this to be true. I have come to a conclusion here but it still needs another explanation. And thus we are still concerned with the colonial problem whose nature, cause and result must be more fully explained to understand the character of the conflict.

The search for the causes of colonisation is almost as old as colonisation itself. And again and again investigators produce the main facts of the existence of *conflicts*. But what we are concerned with mostly now, is which conflict is decisive. And that is the object of this speech!

It is obvious that the older writers tended to begin their investigation at the first concept of primitive peoples. Their attention was particularly drawn by the wars resulting from such contacts, the consequence of which was that the stronger tribe ruled the weaker ones. In this conflict between strong and weak they saw the cause of colonisation. And a German scholar of the middle of the last century, Gustav Klemm, explained colonisation in his work *The Spreading of Active Human Races over the World*[1] as the result of the existence of *active* and *passive* races. It was the active races who for some reason or another must have felt the urge to find new dwelling places and then on meeting other tribes they started to rule those, thus becoming the first colonisers. According to the ancient wellknown hypothesis Klemm, too, regarded the mountains as the original homeland of the active races. From this height they descended into the plains and chased the passive human races. These peaceful, quiet inhabitants of the plains were often and unexpectedly surprised by the advancing heroes of the active races. Their goods and chattels and even they themselves were captured and taken into the mountains. Greed and new loot resulted in further and more elaborate predatory excursions. And when arriving in the coastal areas, where the sea formed a natural boundary, they remained rulers over the passive races. According to Klemm a general path formed along the routes of their wanderings, which later developed into a trade route.

Of the causes of those excursions Klemm mentions the urge for possession, the urge for fame, the urge for something new and the

urge for collectivity, the urge for freedom and finally overpopulation.

According to Klemm these forces gathered from the movement of primitive peoples, also, though probably to a different extent, underly the new colonisation of for instance the Spaniards, Portuguese, Dutch etc.

Whilst respecting the thoughts of the German scholar and recognizing his outstanding originality, I must disagree with his conclusions. I too find this theory useful for the explanation of the original migration of nations, and in my opinion they can elucidate the *older forms of colonisation* or settlements. However, I would like to point out that in my opinion this theory cannot gauge the motives which have led to *modern colonisation.* It is *undoubted* that the *causes* underlying the latter are much *deeper* than just the urge for possession, urge for fame, urge for new things, urge for collectivity, urge for freedom and overpopulation. These facts may relate to individuals, even perhaps to certain *groups of the population,* but in *no way an entire nation.* Taken over a whole nation they are not strong enough to induce it to dominate another people. Now if we assume that the colonial situation *as such* implies that a certain people establishes its own sovereign authority on another territory, inhabited by a people that does not belong to its own race, then we can only doubt whether the urge of a few individuals alone would be sufficient to induce the whole of the nation to such a deed. It is certainly *conceivable* that the colonial possession is prepared by some enterprising individuals – and this possibility is recognized and sanctioned by international law – that before a people would be ready to try their hand at colonisation, there must have existed deeper grounds for it than merely urge for possession and fame or something similar.

Without those deeper motives people would never be willing to undertake such a venture that will doubtlessly bring with it innumerable reverses.

The theory that the urge for new things could induce a people to acquire colonies is not at all valid. Obviously this urge can be present in individuals, but it is very unlikely to exist in a people as a whole. On the contrary, a people is so tied to its native country, that it will not leave it at any price. Especially in our modern times such a colossal migration of nations is completely inconceivable.

The urge for collectivity usually concerns the internal organisation of a country. Neither does the aspiration to place people of the

same religion under one political body find much support nowadays. In no way can it be used as an explanation of modern colonisation.

And finally as regards the urge for freedom, which phrase Klemm uses to indicate *personal freedom* and overpopulation: these factors usually make people emigrate; at the most they could be the cause of the formation of colonies in other parts of the world with a similar climate. But modern colonisation cannot be explained that way.[2]

So if we reject Klemm's arguments, what then are the deeper grounds that lead to modern colonisation? This motive must be of such overpowering strength that even considerations of right and humanity have to give way to it. For practically everybody will admit, even Jules Harmand, that the domination of another people, from the point of view of humanity, is condemnable. Even Jules Harmand says in his *Domination and colonisation* that it is a deed of immorality to deprive a nation of its independence. But he continues: it is an enforced immorality. 'It is one of the manifestations of the universal struggle for life, to which we are all doomed, not only by nature that condemns us to either winning or losing, but even more by our civilisation, which cannot allow' – and this is the crux of his argument – 'vast and fertile areas of the world to be lost to us and to humanity because of the incapacity of those that live there and because of the bad use they make of it while they are left to their own resources'.

So if it is obvious from the opinion of this man who is an authority in every way in the field of colonial politics, that the struggle for life is the cause and 'exploitation' the objective of colonisation, then we have also unveiled the secret that the problem of colonisation is rooted in *material needs*. The main cause of colonial expansion lies in the great need for supplies of the colonising people. Now it is a fact that the needs of every human being in general, and of the Westerner in particular with his strongly selfish character, show a curious conflict, which has led to organised action; the unlimited number of needs as opposed to the quantitative insufficiency of means-satisfaction. Whereas in general the Eastern people, for whom as the English economist Marshall said so rightly, 'a placid serenity is the highest ideal of life' will resign themselves to some extent to a given situation, the materialistic and selfish Westerner will continually resist those unpleasant feelings and search for means of releaving it. His uncomfortable lack of welfare will make him look for satisfaction. And when he cannot

find it in his own country, he will have to look for it elsewhere. The urge for self-preservation will create in a people as a whole, in the present system of international law, a more or less aggressive nature. Their greedy eyes will soon turn towards the fertile territories, of which the sources of welfare are in the hands of the resident people. The peaceful way to get hold of this abundance of products would be an intensive trade with the areas. But fear of competition on the one hand, and the desire to have the monopoly of the sources of income on the other hand, result in the awful subjection of those peoples by the exploitation of their physical powers and their soil.

Although we may call this a *policy of robbery* it suits the purpose of the Western peoples' world dominion. As much as in a primitive society, the right of the strongest still has undiminished power in this modern society. Anyway the character of present international society does not basically differ from that of a primitive society. In the latter there is a lack of legal organisation, but in the former too we look in vain for an international legal system that regulates and guarantees the rights and obligations of the nations in a world society. In both there is no protection of the security of the individual or of the people. The international treaties that nations enter into can only alter the degree of difference but cannot bring about a basic change. For what is the best way to guarantee the security of person and goods? Let us have a look at a modern constitutional state! Here we can see how the individuals within the borders of the state territory are bound to a certain legal order, in which it has become usual since Montesquieu to divide the government into the legislature, the executive and the judiciary, while the police as an executive organ see to it that public order is not disturbed. In this way individuals get accustomed to what has once been accepted as law by national society. There are laws that guarantee their rights.

The situation is very different in international society! Here we find neither a legislature, nor an executive, nor a judiciary. Nor is there an international police force. And as long as there is no international jurisdiction – and I fear that it will not be brought about within the near future –, any thought about the formation of an international police force, is, as Professor Van Vollenhoven rightly said in 1913, pie in the sky. And that is why France's endeavours at the Peace Treaty of Versailles when they drew up a Treaty of the League of Nations, to create a League of Nations Army met

with unsurmountable practical and political difficulties. In spite of the progress of civilisation, international society can still be called primitive. Here nations stand next and opposite each other almost without any protection from laws. The treaties made only restrict the uncertainties and the lack of laws, but they do not give any absolute guarantees. And it is always the weaker nations that come off worst. Although the introduction of the concept of 'sovereignty' within the nation in international society has been established, foreign interference in national affairs being restricted to a minimum within its own territory, it does not lie in its power to guarantee the promotion of national interests outside the country. And the danger of this situation is not imaginary, when one realises that with the development of international contact the foreign interests of a nation will increase more than proportionately. Thus a conflict of interests is unavoidable. How to solve this problem, when there is not a single institution that can make a binding decision? How can a nation defend its rights? So far the only means that nations have at their disposal for the defence of their national rights is as it was for the primitive peoples: *violence*, which is now called war. Mutual arbitration pacts which modern states tend to make cannot prevent these disasters. For in most cases nations are only prepared to submit those conflicts to arbitration which do not concern the honour, the existence and the independence of the nation. Conflicts of the latter category are usually not susceptible to arbitration and in general are usually settled by violence. It goes without saying that in this kind of international society the absolutism of the strongest can be called the law.

And now one might ask how it is possible that since in the individual states that are part of the *League of Nations*, one already finds an ordered kind of existence, the *League of Nations* itself can still be termed primitive. Yet there is no discrepancy here. For the key to this puzzle lies in the fact that in national society the individual is entitled to rights; in international society however only a nation or a state can have rights.[3] The great difference in mentality between the two is clear. It is one of the merits of the French psychologist Gustav le Bon (in his *Psychologie des foules*) to have pointed out that the masses consider that the unity has a totally different psyche from the individuals that make it up. And that is not surprising, for a society does not consist of the simple sum of the individuals, but of the multiplication of common feelings, desires and action. Although the separate individuals may be peace-

ful and tolerant, as part of the crowd they are ruled by the collective psyche, in which the primitive instincts play an important part. The atavistic character of a crowd soon comes to the foreground, as soon as their existence is at stake. Then war is unavoidable.

It would take too long to dwell on the problem of individual and mass psychology here. With this short exposé I only want to show that colonisation has not the slightest connection with the fundamental concept of right, as we know it in modern society, which is rooted in the sense of justice of society. It is nothing but a power usurpation euphemistically called right, practised by a nation that has got the power and the desire for it. In international societies every action of the strongest can be called a right, even though it may concern robbery or violence. And that is why every appeal of a colonised people to the general sense of justice for recognition of its right to independence is mostly futile and can be dismissed as a means of achieving this freedom. We know that this so-called general opinion is formed for the greater part by the opinions of colonising people themselves and their allies. A subjugated nation has to create *under its own steam* its right to a national existence. Those of you who are not blind and deaf will know that the great European powers, in order to restrict the conflict of interests between them to a minimum, enter into treaties in which it is stated that every participating state will have freedom of action within the territories that have been agreed upon in the treaty. And thus until the first world war the fates of nations were determined by the strongest of the countries commonly called *European Entente*. And those who assume that the fate of this European Entente was sealed with the coming of the first world war, are completely mistaken. With Locarno it all started again. For then they succeeded in bringing together the old enemies and to create the conditions for a new European stronghold. More than ever the European powers realise the significance of European solidarity, in the main to restrict the rise of the coloured races, but in reality to establish their hegemony over those races. And rightly did the Austrian economist, Herr Ludwig Mises, state in his *Gemeinwirtschaft*: 'The power of the concept of violence is obviously not restricted to material possessions alone. The spirit which puts its entire trust in pure violence and which seeks the gift of the welfare state not in resignation, but in continuous struggle, permeates life at all levels. All human relationships are determined by the right of the strongest, which basically means the denial of right'. And what he says after

that is just as true. 'Peace does not exist, at the most there is an armistice'.

And that is why it would be a betrayal of the national principle, when one tries to relegate the national movement to the field of humanism instead of an actual policy based on *existing* racialism and conflicts of interest. Never have the dominating nations entertained considerations of humanity if the security of their objectives was concerned.

In a few words I have already indicated that the lack of prosperity of the so-called civilised nations of Western and Central Europe has led to the subjection and domination of weaker people, whose land was so abundantly endowed by Mother Nature. In the name of civilisation a predatory expedition is organised to get hold of their sources of welfare. And as a panacea for the wounded hearts of the colonised the excuse is often used that colonisation is the task of civilisation. They then say that colonisation is necessary for the sake of humanity, because – as I already quoted from Jules Harmand's idea – the abundant products of the earth must be used on behalf of humanity and so that they may not remain unexploited through the impotence of those that possess them. The second panacea which apparently has quite some influence on the hearts of the patient among the colonised, is the one that the colonial situation would cease to exist as soon as the 'natives' were capable of devoting their powers and the resulting profits of the land to the welfare of the community.

So what would be the solution? The same Jules Harmand, the wellknown trumpeter of the colonisers, finds the following situation the ideal solution: 'The day when there will be no more force, no more domination; this means that there will be no more than one society, one single political community; a new nationality will be born, coinciding with the one of the conqueror's'. So the colony must according to him be dissolved in the mother country, although he realises how difficult this would be. But the misled and patient part of the colonised believe in a voluntary release of the colony by the mother country on the strength of the word 'stop' alone.

Now the question is: In view of the requirements of humanity, and those of the colonising powers in particular, is it probable that the glorious day on which the colony will be voluntarily released by the mother country, as soon as it proves to be capable of exploiting its own soil, and thus of using the products of it for the welfare of humanity, will ever come?

By posing this question I am approaching the examination of the structure of the present world economy. From it we will have to conclude whether this voluntary release of the colony is conceivable or not. In the short time I have at my disposal there can be no question of a complete examination. I will have to restrict myself to the main features, but even of those main features I can only touch on what is most characteristic. For a subject such as world economy requires at least – if one wants to be at all complete – a number of volumes.

I will begin with Western and Central Europe, the cradle of economic and political imperialism. Whereas the middle ages were characterised by economic self-sufficiency and the limitedness of social life and the economic unity at that time was still restricted to the town and the surrounding territory, new times brought about a gradual extension of contacts. And with the rise of national states, the economic structure of society also changed. The previous self-sufficiency was replaced by mutual dependence in an economic sense. And from that time onwards Western European society showed a strongly dynamic character and it experienced a complete regeneration on the eve of the latest era. Two factors in particular gave the decisive impulse to a complete revolution in society: the *individual* revolution originating from France and the *industrial* revolution originating from England. Whereas the former led to the emancipation of the individual and the destruction of the old classes and medieval feudalism, the latter caused a complete transformation of economic and social life. However there is a close connection between these two factors. For the victory of individualism did not fail to exercise a meaningful influence on the structure of the society of that time and on the economic policy of those days. The latter particularly finds expression in the much-praised principle of free exchange. Particularly is this expression found in the numerous inventions in the technical field. The application of steam power and electricity was introduced on a large scale into industry and transport and thus did the human intellect of those days produce large amounts of materials for the revolutionisation of the whole society. Very rapidly the whole production system was industrialised. And eventually individualism increases egotism and lust for gain which would become the engine of the capitalist production process. When it is all-important to make high profits, it is obvious that agriculture will fall into the background. The

application of the rationalistic principle is followed through with extreme consistency. Industrialism in its turn strengthens individualism. And all this culminated in the Cobdon treaty of 1860.

The radical change in society also took place in the field of transport. Steam-boats replaced the old wooden ships and scoured the seas. The network of railways was greatly expanded at an incredible rate. Within twenty years the total length had risen from 3.800 km. to 225.000 km. In this way fertile but until recently isolated areas were opened up, thus enabling them to participate in international trade. Soon a difficulty that was originally assumed to be insurmountable, that of large distances between various production and consumption areas was soon overcome by fast means of transport. And since the introduction of telegraphy the element of time that also was an impediment in the communication between two ends of the world was almost entirely eliminated. This has contributed a great deal to the creation of world markets or exchanges, which resulted in there being practically the same price for similar articles all along the line at a certain point of time. Other factors leading to standardisation are arbitration and the future market. The latter is especially of importance for the fixing of prices and for the regulation of the need over different periods. It brings production and consumption which are separated by the difference in time nearer each other. The exchange and banking system are developing rapidly.

Bank capital plays an important part in the financing of business ventures and in the provision of credit to states. In economically undeveloped countries bank capital exerts a great and direct influence via the government on the course of affairs, even in the field of politics. Especially in the exploitation of economic sources, in particular oil, bank capital is deeply involved. All this takes place almost automatically via the financial centres with their very sensitive exchange mechanism. Thus one could say that the exchange has become the barometer of business life. To a certain extent it even serves as a compass to the industrial producer. Since industrial production now takes place on a large scale and anticipates the demands on the market – as opposed to production on order as happened previously, economic life is characterised by great instability. The dynamic movement of adaptation and disturbance in equilibrium between the production and demands makes economic cycles unavoidable. The present economic system can hardly avoid the periodicity of depression. Neither the concentra-

tion of production branches nor powerful bodies such as trusts, cartels and syndicates, nor concentration of banking has been able so far to change the rhythmic fluctuations of economic life.

The industrialisation movement first started in England; more than half a generation later this example was followed by France, Belgium and Germany. And since 1880 the industrialisation of Europe had been increasing rapidly. It creates problems and causes new demands, which obviously influence foreign trade. The inequality in industrial development and perfection leads inevitably to the rise of economic nationalism, as a typical product of young industrial countries, of which Germany is the classic example. A war of tariffs is the consequence of it. All this continually produces new materials for violent conflicts, as the last fifty years have shown us.

As the first consequence of industrialisation we must mention the great increase in the European population. The increased birth-rate and the decreased mortality are the direct causes of this. In less than half a century the population of Europe has more than doubled. All this has created a situation in which Europe did not develop fast enough to feed its population. Because of increasing industrialisation, which pushes agriculture more and more into the background, the imbalance in Europe is a continually increasing vicious circle. In this way Europe is getting more and more dependent for the provision of its most basic necessities of life on other parts of the world. And especially dependent on the tropics and the East! This dependence is the Achilles heel of modern Europe. If one can strike there one can control her. Europe tries to protect this vulnerable spot by conducting an imperialistic policy. And so as a consequence we can see the colonial scramble of the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

But Europe has another vulnerable spot and that is: the *lac*k of materials for industry in its own countries. For the provision of those it is also dependent on the rich tropical countries and the East. Europe is also dependent on the same areas for marketing its industrial products. These contrasts in the natural distribution of sources are very striking at the moment. While Europe has a shortage of everything that concerns its most basic demands, all around it there are areas with unlimited possibilities. Food products, raw materials for industry and mineral wealth are found in abundance in their natural stocks.

And this is the situation the present economic world order is in!

Although both groups of countries could have been satisfied by

means of international exchange and international co-operation, it turned out differently. We have seen how selfish Europe prefers to achieve survival by its primitive instincts which are present in the masses, rather than by following the peaceful route of international exchange. We have seen that the world order is still primitive. And since there is no body that can arrange the interest of the nations in the world society with justice, what is easier for Europe, than providing itself with its most basic necessities of life by simply seizing the inexhaustible resources of other countries? When it looks as if conflicts will arise, diplomats come in to come to an amicable arrangement by consultation between the two parties. And thus foreign parts are not only colonised but also divided into spheres of influence and interests and financial protectorates, without the consent of the rightful claimants. At the same time these countries must serve as markets for the European industrial products. All kinds of obstacles, such as extra-territorial rights of foreigners (Westerners) and an enforced tariff system are put in their way in order to prevent the rise of their own industry. For the industrialisation of the East would be competition for Europe and threaten Europe's industrial existence.

And thus we see how Western economic imperialism, springing from the lack of material resources, will inevitably be accompanied by political imperialism. They are merely two sides of one and the same phenomenon. Within the framework of economic and political imperialism we must now try to examine the colonial problem and the problem of racialism connected with it.

In view of the three main causes of modern colonisation, people's need for food, the need for raw materials and the need for a market for one's own industrial products, it is clear why any growth of the colony towards economic independence is never tolerated by the coloniser and it is also clear why such a growth is opposed in every possible way. Limitation of organisation, coercive measures, tax and tariff policy, are the obvious means. And since *political independence* is one of the most important sources – if not the most important – of economical growth, it goes without saying that it would not suit economic and political imperialism to voluntarily release the colony. On the other hand one cannot demand from a colony that it should resign itself to the situation of political and economic slavery. The colonies have come to realise now what Galbaud expressed so well, that 'the restoration of order by for-

eigners is normally called by other people servitude'. The colonial situation not only results in severe limitation of the freedom of the subject people, but also causes the undermining of its welfare – as is clearly shown in the above exposition.

Thus we see how the colonial situation is strongly influenced by the powerful law of conflict. Conflict manifests itself here in its full force, because it is the very basic needs of two peoples that are opposed here in the situation of ruler and ruled. The situation as such already indicates, that only the interests of the stronger, that is of the ruler, are taken into account. There is not a single point where the interests of both parties run parallel. Therefore there is no other means for the colony to escape this humiliating situation of slavery than by means of violence. Thus if we want to serve our fatherland, we will have to purposefully direct our national movement along those lines.

That the recovering of our freedom can only be brought about by revolution, is also recognized by our *moderate* people. Yet they differ from us in the means they are willing to use before proceeding to violence. That is because they have not thought about their policy deeply enough and because they do not take into account the real nature of the problem and reality. For instance the moderates believe in the *dogmatic* principle of *cooperation*, *dogmatic* because they start from an unproved thesis of faith in the 'good intentions of the ruler'. We however will not risk such a speculation; we should only take into account the real nature of the real situation. And that simply is why we accept the realistic principle of *non-cooperation.*

To prove their *faith* the moderates often use the naive wheelbarrow theory which approximately means the following: 'if I have to push a wheelbarrow from The Hague to Paris and somebody offers to help push as far as Brussels, then I will say "yes please". On arrival in Brussels I will then say: "Thank you very much" and I will go on wheeling my barrow to my destination'.

Well, that is the wheelbarrow theory, as naive as naive can get! But with the same naivety we could ask the moderates the following question: What would you do if your helper prevents you from going to Paris or leads you the wrong way, so that you end up in Berlin instead of Paris, which takes you even further from home? But that is enough of such naivety and childish considerations. We have already established that it is impossible to give a proper argumentation for the policy of cooperation. The basic starting point

for the moderates is, as we have already said, the belief that the ruler will be willing to help the colony a long way on their route to freedom. According to the doctrine of the moderates the milestone on this route would be the self-determination of the colony. This is basically self-deception. For the ruler knows very well that as soon as the colony, inhabited by a people of a different race, has been given self-determination, it will not be very difficult for it, completely to break away from the motherland. Race consciousness and the sense of self-esteem oblige it to do this. Thus the gift of self-determination to the colony means giving the key to independence. Thus when the independence of the colony is prevented at all costs by the mother country, such a presumption is logically inconceivable. The logical untenableness of the moderate presumption we can also prove in an empirical way, when we view the systems of government of every colony where racial conflict occurs. But I would require too much of your attention and too much time if I were to review the system of government of every colony separately.[4] As such it could be quite boring too. And that is why I will restrict myself to a résumé and an analytical examination which will show that even the so-called self-governing colonies – and I mean those that are inhabited by another race than those in the ruling group – ultimately merely has a *fake* self-government. According to their nature we can classify all those systems of government into three main groups, which really all boil down to the maintenance of domination of the ruling white race over the coloured colonial population. For this colonial method of deception the ruled must always be on the lookout. Let us have a look at the three main groups of systems!

In those cases where the colony has a so-called 'representative' body (I), it always amounts to a majority of white elements. The organisation of the election system can easily take care of that. Yes, even in those cases where the 'representative' body is exclusively formed by the native people (II) we see that the rule of the ruler remains the dominating factor in the direction of the course of affairs. For in this case it is seen to that the majority of the members of the council consists of civil servants who, if desired, have to vote for the official motions. And if the majority of members in such a council consists of members who are not civil servants (III) then this body is simply reduced to a purely advisory institution. In a direct way this is done openly by indicating it as such, indirectly by the unlimited veto of the white Governor-general or viceroy.

Regardless of which colonial system one examines – excepting that of the Philippines – and whatever way one turns it, it is always possible to classify it under one of these three main groups. And we have seen that everywhere it amounts to the perpetuation of the rulers' domination. That is why one should not foster too many illusions regarding the possibility of obtaining true self-government. When this cannot even be considered obtainable, then we must suppose that any co-operation with the ruler is deceptive in character.

Both experience and logic condemn the act of co-operation. And understandably so, for co-operation is only possible when there is a common basis for it, that is only in those cases where interests run parallel. I have just tried to explain that the whole colonial situation is dominated by the conflict of interests, springing from the nature of the economic world and from the fundamental nature of a community of nations. The consequence is that co-operation with the ruler is the same as co-operation with one's own ruin. At any rate common sense will tell us that the co-operation of two powers which move in two opposite directions is impossible.

It must have become clear by now, that our principle of non-cooperation springs from reality and is confirmed by a scientific analysis of the facts. Therefore it is the only proper point of view for us in the struggle for our national independence. But our non-cooperation has a completely different character from that which one normally tends to connect with the name of Mahatma Ghandi. Whereas the latter puts the emphasis on so-called passivity and non-violence in his policy, which is in accordance with the religious nature of the Indian people, we emphasise activity. For in this struggle we must remain passive for ever or we will be smashed. Our non-cooperation has only this in common with that of Ghandi, that we, like him, disapprove of every act of political co-operation with the ruler. But there the similarity stops. Activity should be the order of the day in our national struggle. Everybody who wants to be free and gain that freedom, must have confidence in his own power and ability. Activity and willingness to make sacrifices must come first, for without these two factors every movement lacks the driving force without which every organisation is doomed to fail. And our victory can only be guaranteed by a sound organisation. For what is the secret of the ruler, that he can maintain his domination of a population with a much larger number of people of another hostile race with the means he has available? The answer is *powerful* organisation! Therefore organisation is the source of power.

Such a sound organisation is of great importance, especially to us, for within the framework of the policy of non-cooperation and self-esteem, we have to move in the direction of the *formation of a state within a state*, that is in the same direction in which Ireland and modern Turkey have moved with so much success. And naturally one will have to create a complete organisation in this administration, which will be fundamentally the same as the organisation of a modern state, so that it can immediately begin to function as soon as the foreign government has been overthrown. I will not dwell on the elaboration of this thought, for I do not think that a meeting such as this is the proper place for it. I will only draw your attention to the great importance of trade unions, of for instance labourers, lawyers, doctors, engineers etc. and the co-operative societies (production, consumption and credit co-operations) in the struggle for national independence, although they are basically economic in nature . . . If the trade unions are well organised, then they will be perfectly capable of bringing the colonial machine to a standstill and consequently of destroying the colonial regime. And co-operative societies are especially important for national economic reconstruction. Under the powerful domination of foreign capital with the foreign government as its natural guardian, as is the case in Indonesia at the moment, which only results in misery and pauperism, only a co-operative organisation of the economy could defend itself against this. At the moment it is the only economic form of organisation which has any chance of success in laying the foundations for our economical reconstruction. A typical example of this is Denmark, which is also called 'the co-operative commonwealth'. By means of a co-operative organisation the Danish people have succeeded in rising from their situation of poverty into one of the most prosperous nations in the world. While trying to regain our national freedom, the economic struggle must not lag behind the political struggle. Both are indispensable factors in the achievement of our ultimate ideal.

Whereas it has been clearly proved that colonisation is the result of the present nature of the economic cosmos and of the character of the international community, the colonial situation itself – can one expect anything else? – is characterised by conflicts of power. Only the coloniser's greater power can possibly maintain such a situation of international slavery. In the same way it is only the power of the ruled that can bring this to an end.

With the increase of self-assertion in the colonised peoples the conflict of power increases in severity and shows an extremely dynamic character. As the negro scholar Du Bois, leader of the American Negroes said, 'the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the colour line'. The present conflicts of power between different races. The signs are already perceptible that the moment of the enormous bloody clash between the *coloured* and the now dominating *white* races will not be long in coming. The yawning abyss between both groups of races is widening day by day: it cannot be bridged over any more. In the coloured world there is already the beginnings of a stubborn resistance against the white rulers. We can already see a small drama taking place on the North coast of Africa and in the mountains of Asia Minor. But this is child's play in comparison with what is yet to come . . . from the Pacific. Since the time that the Pacific began to show economic prosperity, it has naturally become the focus of interest of world politics. Conflicts of power have formed, which will ripen into a violent drama, the extent of which we cannot imagine yet. For once the Pacific drama has started, it will not only be a bloody meeting between East and West, it will also be the occasion on which all coloured races will settle accounts with the domineering whites. And the world will only get a better structure, when the coloured races emerge as victors from this fight. For their peaceful nature and tolerance are better guarantees for a general world peace. Then the colonial problem will be solved in the sense that all nations in the world will from then on live together freely and independently on a basis of equality. Only then can there be question of fraternisation between the nations. However much one may regret it, inexorable is the historical law that the lasting happiness of humanity will only be attained by shedding blood and tears. Without such a drama, humanity would never be free of the gruesome grasp of Western imperialism and weaker nations will always have to come off worse. Thus the destruction of Western imperialism is an action for the benefit of civilisation. As such it is the *duty* of every colonised nation, that feels it is entitled to the description civilisation, to liberate itself. Not only are the political interests of the world community of nations served in that way but also their economic interests.

Under the hegemony of Western imperialistic states international trade cannot fully and harmoniously unfold itself, for too much communal energy is given to the satisfaction of purely European

needs, whilst vital needs of other nations, which are on a higher plane, remain almost neglected. As such this fact is contrary to the second (economic) law of Gossen which says that in his daily life every individual, for the satisfaction of his needs of various kinds, always aims at the levelling of the marginal utility of these needs. On the strength of the psychological disposition of the human being not a single need will be satisfied, as long as there are needs on a higher plane that are not satisfied. This spontaneous reaction of the individual in his daily life we do not find in the *nations* of the world community under the hegemony of Western imperialism. If one wants to see this Gossen law at work in the community of nations, then the task of international trade (in material and immaterial goods) must be to see that the principal needs of all nations, without exception, are satisfied in the order of their significance for these peoples. And this will spontaneously happen when all peoples can govern themselves. Then every nation will receive a reward in accordance with the marginal productivity of its labour. Under the present circumstances, while the selfish West runs the show and there are still nations that are bowed down by the colonial regime, the realisation of this ideal cannot yet be expected. For the universal economic laws, however fundamental they are, can only assert their full influence in an organised social and legal situation.

I have already said that western imperialism must be destroyed for the sake of humanity and that it is the duty of every colonised nation to shake off the foreign yoke. And that is why Indonesia must obtain its independence for the sake of humanity and civilisation. And I fear that the only means to achieve it, as we have already seen, will be no other than violence.

Athough the emphasis of our struggle lies on the destruction of Dutch imperialism, we must not forget for one moment that our struggle is irrevocably connected with the general Pacific problem. As the border-land of this great expanse which is presently called the Pacific, our country will naturally be involved in the drama to come. We know that this will be the ultimate solution of the racial conflict. Our foreign propaganda, being an important part of our political struggle, must be aimed at the unity of all Eastern peoples. The sharper the racial contrast, the nearer we are to a final showdown, and this racial conflict will only be fully realised when the Eastern people found their own league of nations in opposition to the specifically Western league of nations of Geneva. Then the

distinction between East and West will be complete all along the political line. Will it be possible? I, for my part, think that the foundations for it have already been laid in the surprising rapprochement between Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan and in the Turkish-Russian treaty of the 17th December this year in Paris as a result of the Mosul conflict. There are signs that China, that deeply humiliated country, is beginning to realise that the chances of liberation from the Western policy of violence will be improved by co-operation with other Asians. Japan, which still likes to sail in the European political sea, will also have to realise that it has to play a different role in Asiatic waters. Every member of the Asiatic community of nations must consider it its duty to proceed in the direction of Eastern solidarity.

And this is what our *Perhimpoenan Indonesia* has been working at for some time in its foreign propaganda, which in the first place is aimed at achieving the idea of a general Asiatic students union. As a provisional success I would like to mention the foundation of the 'Association for the Study of Oriental Civilisations' in Paris, which students from almost all countries of Asia have joined. We will now build on and extend the foundations that have already been laid. May the time be with us!

Speech delivered on the entrance of the chairmanship of *Perhimpoenan Indonesia* on the 17th January 1926.

1. Consulted, at the suggestion of Douwes Dekker in his *Koloniaal Ideaal*, intended in 1913 as a propaganda speech for N.I.P. Douwes Dekker himself bases his argument, unlike us, on the ideas of Klemm, to arrive in the end at the justification of the aspiration for a free country.
2. One could object to this, considering the urge for expansion by Italy, and say that overpopulation can indeed lead to colonisation. But I could disagree and say that the present fascist Italy is in the first place imperialistic, looking for power and fame. We all know about Italy's ambition to make a *mare nostrum* of the Mediterranean Sea. Moreover Italy endeavours on the one hand to expand its territory for the sake of its population surplus at the expense of the neighbouring or nearby states, all recognized by International law, with similar climates. It is especially Albania and Asia Minor – perhaps also Dalmatia – that he has in mind. On the other hand Italy endeavours to expand its colonial possessions to create a market for its industrial products. This proves that Italy's urge for colonial expansion has hardly any connection with overpopulation.
3. Compare for this opinion Von Liszt: *Das Völkerrecht*, in particular the second volume. A different opinion is held by Professor Krabbe in his *Moderne Staatsidee*, as a logical consequence of his conception of a state. When one

thinks of the state as merely a community of people with common interests, he says, there is no point in describing the state as the subject of international law. 'Subjects of international law, are those people...' (p. 275). According to him it is only a terminological abbreviation, 'that the state as a community of people with common interests is called the subject of international law', but immediately after words he acknowledges that 'this is actually the case', although with the restriction that if carefully examined it would mean that indirectly it was the people that are concerned after all.

It seems to us that this is an *ideal* that Professor Krabbe is describing here, but in the practice of present international society is not yet present. So we can easily maintain that in international law the nations are the subjects of rights. And in spite of the criticism at least we can agree with Von Liszt that international law – or rather international public law; we are not concerned here with international private law – is based on different principles from national law (see Von Liszt, 12th edition, p. 8 onwards).

4. Those who are interested in this particular point, are referred to the booklet of Professor Stibbe, *Inleiding tot de kennis der bestuursinstellingen in vreemde koloniën.*

4 Some main features of the world economy

INTRODUCTION

If one wants to get some vague idea of what is going on in the world economy, in order to formulate a clear idea of the economic policy that would be suitable under the present circumstances, we are faced with a very complicated problem. The world economy of today shows a picture of chaos. And the most curious fact of all is that part of humanity is still subjected to poverty in the midst of abundance. Everywhere one can discern a tendency to overproduction, everywhere production capacity must be confined by restrictive measures, building restrictions and the like, but one also perceives scenes of underproduction wherever one looks. Whereas in one spot on earth superfluous foodstuffs are thrown into the sea or used as fuel, somewhere else people are starving. A somewhat better distribution of the world's products, which are produced in co-operation between different countries of the world, would already have given another complexion to the world economy. Is it not curious that in the century in which technical inventions and their application in the industrial field have their greatest triumphs, we are at our wits end what to to about the problem of employment which has become a curse on humanity? Is this the result of all the progress that man has made in the spiritual and technical field after all these centuries? It seems to suggest that the unbelievable things that the human brain can create do not make this society as a whole any happier but rather the opposite.

When one realises how extremely badly the world economy functions, then one is astonished at the way in which many a statesman thinks we can improve the prosperity of a people. Instead of reflecting on the disproportion between the ever-increasing capacity of industrial production and the narrowing world markets, they especially apply themselves to thinking up measures to safeguard

the national market from the flood of foreign goods. They do not, however, discuss among themselves that this also at the same time limits the market for the national industries which in many respects suffers from over-capacity. And thus they continually turn round in an ever-increasing vicious circle of over-production and unemployment. And when completely at their wits end they resort to the increase of armaments. It is true that in that way they create employment for a great number of unemployed by starting off other connected industrial productions, and increase in certain respects the spending power of the population, but this apparent revival will only be temporary. For what will this waste of capital on an unproductive concern lead to? On balance this cleverness will end sooner or later in a terrible catastrophe, in a large-scale destruction of life and property of which we have already had a foretaste in Spain and in China. And it is with bitter irony that Professor Dr. J. Goudriaan remarks in his inaugural address at Delft, that 'the arms race is an unequalled means in the fight against unemployment, the only guaranteed means that has as yet been applied.'[1] But then he continues:

'One should let this hard truth sink well into one's mind, that the so-called normal period of a reasonably stable prosperity, which this society has known in the last one-and-a-half centuries, has exclusively been those periods within which wars were fought and even greater wars were prepared for.

Once these preparations are in full progress, then humanly speaking, they cannot be brought to a standstill anymore; for this the atmosphere of international distress is already too deeply rooted and the outbreak of a crisis as the result of the disappearance of the threat of war would be too conspicuous.

Therefore one can predict with a high degree of certainty that we are now approaching a period of economic revival with more moderate crises which will probably find their conclusion in a subsequent world war'.

It is obvious that the great economic wisdom of nowadays does not consist in the fact that people know how to use increased production capacity and the enormous mass of production energy to bring prosperity to the whole of humanity, but in the fact that people are urged to produce unproductive products. And thus everyone can see the chaotic situation of the present economic order. It looks as if it is built up from an amalgamation of economic paradoxes, whereas the first lessons of economy teach us that eco-

nomic action means the achievement of the greatest possible results with as little effort as possible; we see in practice that all activity is directed towards economic destruction and uneconomic action.

If that is so, then there must be a defect in the economic machine that causes the breakdown. An analysis of the main features of the world economy must be able to detect this defect. If we try to sketch this on these pages, then the emphasis will be on the word 'sketch'. For a complete examination of the outlines of the world economy is out of question within the framework of a magazine article.

1

Since the present economic order – and this goes especially for American and West European society – is the product of dynamic development, it would be quite interesting if we could examine it against the background of an era, in which the economy still gave an impression of stability. This is especially important in view of the fact that the greater part of the present economy is still in a more or less static condition. The economic situation as we know it now gives the impression that one part of society is constantly moving, while the other part is constantly at rest.

We must go back to the time of the early Middle Ages,[2] when the whole of the world, as far as is was inhabited, showed a monotonous picture of agricultural communities. Agriculture was the most important means of subsistence, the soil the dominating factor of production. It is true no production is possible without human labour, but this played an inferior part in the agricultural production of those days. They tilled the soil before planting the seed, they occasionally saw to it that there was a regular water distribution and for the rest they left it to nature to bring the product to maturity.

To this day this has remained the essential nature of agricultural production. Even in those places where modern techniques are applied in agriculture, where much change has been achieved in the form and in the results of this production, the fundamental character has remained intact. The main work is done by nature.

When one has sown, one knows exactly by what time one can expect the product at the earliest. The wait of months for the results of one's labour and also the certainty that one can periodically count on the ever-returning harvest, has a soothing influence

on the nerves, and is beneficial to the peace of mind of man. Thus agricultural communities present an image of rest. No-one is in a hurry. Everything is done according to a certain order, which one can normally estimate beforehand. The economic cycle will move along the same lines year after year. The only factors that will disturb the balance but at the same time maybe restore the balance, are bad harvests, and epidemics and the destructions of war. After such a calamity society is brought back more or less to its old level, because an increase of population is cancelled again and every appearing dynamic factor is eliminated again. At the same time those calamities which hang over the heads of insular agricultural communities as an eternal threat, help to strengthen the tendency to resignation. Nature and environment make up the factors that lead to conservatism, fatalism and resignation.

Typical for the universality of the structure of agricultural communities is the remark by Sombart,[3] that 'farming at that time – in spite of the seemingly great variety in the type of settlements – was basically the same in North and South, East and West, and that at any rate it showed a great number of corresponding features, which partly find an explanation in the nature of things'. A little later he says, 'The principle that every farmer's family has a piece of ground that suits its need and its available manpower, is a recurring feature of all nations'. The ground belongs to the community. The principle of the satisfaction of needs – production according to need – determines each man's share in the use of the ground. Everyone can initially take as much as he needs, but he may not sell it. From the same principle also springs the assistance that the members of the community give each other. And finally the same principle results in every family, besides agriculture, engaging in home industry. Thus the agricultural community merits the description of economic self-sufficiency. As a characteristic of the agricultural community we should also mention the limitedness and the stability of the needs. The consumption on which the production is based, is historically and traditionally determined. As a result production is not based on an accurate estimation of the needs in the future but is regulated by the past. Thus economic activities are orientated towards the perpetuation of the existing order. As long as the ground is the dominating factor in the production process, the traditional spirit will resist every fundamental change.

In a completely agricultural community the individual stays in the background. The individual always feels part of the organic

unity. Outside the context of his village he is nothing. But for the disposal of his possessions and the use of his economic powers he is dependent on the consent of his fellow-villagers. In his conduct in life he has to strictly conform to the rules of the existing morals, to the established tradition. For public opinion is hard and inexorable in that respect. A certain prejudice against a person caused by a false step will survive from generation to generation. Under the laws of this all-powerful tradition everybody must satisfy his individuality, his personal views, as far as he has got any, and subordinate them to the little-changing collective idea. And that is why an agricultural community maintains its original character in the midst of all the changes in the world. Static laws are in the majority there. There is movement, but no change.

And this is the picture that vast areas in Asia and South America still present.

A breach was made in this wall of peaceful communities, when in the late Middle Ages towns appeared on the European continent. Then a dynamic element entered into economic life: trade.

Contrary to the self-sufficiency in the country, the economy of a town is based on the exchange of goods and services. Here they can no longer produce all the necessities of life themselves. They are dependent on the products of others. Where life is unconnected with the soil with its ever-recurring produce, one is deprived of a secure existence. One's livelihood is dependent on the results of one's creative labour. For here one lives crowded together on a relatively small piece of ground, where one can hardly have more ground at one's disposal than the site on which one's house is built. In town one loses as it were the 'firm ground', the anchorage of one's existence. Not without wit did more than one writer remark that townsfolk have spiritually returned to a nomadic life.[4] He does not get his existence handed to him on a plate but he has to 'look for it'. Just as a Nomadic people wanders around searching for a point of support in its existence, the towndweller spiritually roves around searching for a suitable occupation. This also explains the often visible mirthlessness of towns people. In the field of handicraft the original towndweller found an outlet for his urge for physical work. The resulting artifact he would then exchange for agricultural products from the country. Thus the marketplace came into existence within the walls of the town as the centre of trade.

Initially the trade was between the town and the surrounding

country. But besides the handicraft industry there was a gradual development of professional trade which transported the products of the town and its surroundings to far-off places and sold them there. And conversely it brought products from foreign parts back home, with which it fed the local market. Later on the money trade developed in turn which occupied itself with the exchange of foreign coins, brought along by their own and foreign merchants, for their own money. That trade of money eventually developed into banking. As trade became more intensive and the economic horizon wider and wider, new concerns grew up from the trade, such as the insurance business, the transport business and so on. From handicraft the factory developed and the factory grew into the modern business concern with its giant enterprises. The market too underwent a metamorphosis, from an open place in town into an exchange with telephone communications all over the world. Thus the national economy and the world economy grew from the town economy. Thus it is not without reason that the town is often called the mother of trade. It is obvious that the town, in addition to being the economic centre also developed into a centre for cultural life.[5]

Why was it a town[6] with its trade that became the source of dynamic changes in economic life? Unlike the soil, labour, which is originally the dominating factor of production in the town, is not inexhaustible. Moreover, it is not a typical characteristic of its produce to supply the basic necessities of life. It only serves as an object which can be exchanged for the basic necessities of life. As such its exchange value ultimately depends on the appreciation of the countrymen, who want to accept it in exchange for food. Whereas the need for food is constantly present, the need for a work of art or a work of handicraft is greatly dependent on the taste of the consumer and on the extent to which the latter has already been supplied with that article.

As long as there was a direct exchange between the town and the country and as long as labour ran on demand, the market for one's labour produce was ensured. It became a different matter however when there was no more demand for the goods that were regularly produced. Much time was lost in acquiring the skill to produce another good that was much in demand at that moment. The situation changed completely when indirect exchange by means of money replaced direct exchange and when people started to produce for the market instead of on demand. Then the risks involved in labour could not be eliminated any more. So, as is to be expected, the ele-

ment of risk is a part of the price calculation that cannot be neglected. And the existence of this element forces the craftsman, the merchant or the businessman to live in the future.[7] Whereas the countryman is orientated to the past, the towndweller is orientated to the future. Provision for the future, remarks Hildebrand[8] – gives us an excellent opportunity to use the surplus of today for the benefit of the future. Since the use of saving can be felt every minute, he says a little further on, money provides a stimulant to do one's utmost to obtain results over and above the needs of the moment. This will pave the way for an increase in prosperity. By means of money it has become possible for everybody to work himself up into the propertied classes. And since money can be held in one hand, money trade creates the possibility of acquiring economic power without property. And so the town laid the first foundations of the economic system that is called capitalism.

Thus we have revealed the secret of why the village is the source of economic stability and the town is the source of economic unrest, of dynamic changes in economic life. The town is the birthplace of Faustus.

Spengler[9] characterises the above, saying that a townless country means thinking in goods, a town means thinking in money and world economy means mobilising goods by money. If we describe the present world as a composition of village and town, then we have momentarily drawn its picture. The question is, how are these two organised and how do these communities relate to each other.

2

As long as there is a balance between town and village, there is harmony in economic life. In the Middle Ages, when economic unity was formed by the town and the surrounding area and where economic contact with other places occurred very seldom, there was a natural economic balance. The country only produced the surplus above its own consumption that it could sell. And its market was traditionally determined. The town industry on the other hand only produced as many products as had been ordered. Because of the closed environment the dynamic and balance-distrubing elements could not develop. This only happened when the economic horizon started to widen and the principle of economic responsibility was completely accepted.

Although the individual in the Medieval town was the person responsible for economic action, the traditionally collective mentality took care that everybody had a reasonable existence in accordance with the tradition of his class, i.e. the class in which he was born and bred and to which his progeny would belong. The result of this was that every craftsman made it a point of honour to supply a work of art. He lived as Sombart[10] expresses it, in his work, just as an artist lives in it and usually does not care about the price his works will fetch. And so the pace of labour was determined by two factors: by the requirement for a good and solid piece of work and by the natural need of the worker himself. In this class society, in which the classes were considered each other's complements in conformity with Divine ordinance,[11] the economic mentality was still pre-capitalistic. The pursuit of gain as the determinant of production was still unknown, although the tendency had been there since the birth of the town.

But the moral self-discipline resulting from the nature of the more or less closed community, proved to be insufficient to check rising individualism. The town authorities everywhere had to take complementary measures to maintain the economic balance.

In general it was agreed that the destiny of the village lay exclusively in the production of agricultural products, while the town was the proper place for the exercise of arts and crafts. Consequently it was often thought necessary to take measures, such as clothing restrictions, which were all intended to prohibit the start of industry in the country. Industry in the country would undermine the economic life of the town and would eventually mean the downfall of the town itself with all its cultural creations.

Furthermore the town authority took measures to protect both producers and consumers. This is purely the result of the medieval thought that everybody has a right of existence in accordance with his station in life. For the protection of the producer there were regulations for the way in which the trade should be practised, what the relationship between master and servant should be and what wages should be paid etc. Within the trade the regulations were left to the organisations of the craftsmen, the Guild, which also had great influence on the town authorities. Unfair competition among the Guild members was threatened with punishment. For the protection of the consumer the quality of the product and the pricing was supervised in various ways. The price of the basic foodstuffs was determined by the authorities. It is curious to note

here that the prohibition of night labour was considered to be in the interest of the consumer, not of the labourer. For the grounds of this prohibition lay in the consideration that the quality of the product would suffer through insufficient lighting, while it was also difficult to carry out a check by night.[12]

In that way the idea of the just price, the *justum pretium*, which played an important part in Medieval society, had a stabilising effect on the economy. Economic stability also had to be protected against the intrusion of foreign merchants, who regularly visited the town market. Against them regulations were brought into existence, such as the so-called street rights, staple right and others, which made it impossible for them to compete with the town's producers. The town was initially hostile to the economic outside world. Finally, these regulations only had as a result that the foreign merchants sold only those products on the town market which were not produced in the town itself. Practice would tell them what taste different towns had and what their special needs were. Thus these regulations of the towns helped to increase the contact between towns. Thus life in the Medieval town was strongly regulated both within and without in the interest of economic balance. But at the same time those regulations resulted in the town becoming the spearhead of economic progress.

The nature of those regulations shows how much a closed environment, mainly producing for the home market, needs economic organisation. A natural consequence of this is that it seeks protection against disturbances which the outside world can cause in its economic life. Planning and *protection* are thus the natural economic policy of a closed community. For in such a community the production possibilities are bound by very definite limits. The difference in size of the closed community may result in gradual differences in economic scope, but the nature of the limitations one cannot escape. A closed community cannot avoid planning of the economy and protection. There can only be differences in the extent of their application. As long as this economic policy is applied precisely and directed towards the interests of all and everything concerned, one can be sure that the economy will show balance and harmony. The unspoilt corporations in the Middle Ages which had not yet been depraved by corruption, and which made the town into the symbol of economic and cultural progress, are the irrefutable proofs.

The depravity of the Medieval town organisations has been

somewhat over-emphasised. People tend to speak only of the spirit of corruption, which gets the upper hand of the idea of solidarity. Easily do they conclude that every organisation involves corruption.

But if one forms an idea of the time when corruption set in, one would get quite a different impression. For corruption started, when the closeness of Medieval communities broke down, when economic life mainly began to take place outside the walls of the town and when the caravan route began to enliven trade between economic units which until then had been isolated. Corruption only set in, when the town as an economic unit had to make way for the nation as an economic unit.

With the widening of the economic boundaries, the State began to regulate economic and political life instead of the town authorities. The independent power of the town was reduced to the position of a local self-government. And it goes without saying that during this transition from old to new various phenomena of degeneracy occurred.

The urge for conservation of what one has again and again made people forget that new times require a different organisation of society. The corporations of the Middle Ages, which were aware of their power, wanted to maintain their legislation rights in the light of the growing capitalism. And that explains the tragic spectacle of corruption as a forerunner of the approaching downfall.

When considering this phenomenon one should not confuse cause and effect, which would give a false picture of what was happening in society. If one wants to arrive at a correct judgement of this phenomenon, one should remember the famous passage from Marx's *Historical Materialism*, which says: 'At some stage of their development the material productive powers will conflict with the existing production situation, or, what is only a legal expression of it, with the ownership of the means of production, within which they have moved so far. From the initial progress the situation of the productive powers changes into slavery'.

And this is true. The productive powers which unfolded towards the end of the Middle Ages at a certain stage did not suit any more the existing system of organisation of the economy. And the corruptions which are so often pointed out, are nothing but phenomena caused by the disappearing form of organisation. Furthermore there is still truth in the following words of Marx. 'A social organisation never disappears, before all possible productive powers have developed and new and higher production situations never replace it be-

fore their material conditions of life have been hatched out in the lap of the old society'.[13]

Only with the appearance of the nation as an economic unit does the town acquire its significance as a source of economic expansion. This takes place in the sense that the town remains the centre of industry, while the market is the whole of the country. With that expansion possibility the nature of production is fundamentally changed. Whereas the producer used to be a more or less passive person only producing on order, he now adopts a more active attitude by anticipating the market. Production could then be described as stock formation. Production is guided by the market price. High prices mean great demand and conversely falling prices are a warning that the market is gradually getting saturated. According to the price level production is stimulated or reduced. Since this adaptation takes time, there is a continual commotion in economic life. The economy cannot escape the process of adaptation and balance-disturbing any more.

As a result of the fact that production is now based on stock formation, the centre of gravity of the production process has been shifted from labour to capital. Capital has become the dominating factor in production. And thus the intiative has also passed into the hands of the capitalist. The independent workman of the Middle Ages is reduced to the position of wage-earner. Whereas he used to be the owner of the tools with which he worked, now they are given to him by the employer. And whereas he could then work in his own workshop and set his own pace, now he has to work together with others in an enclosed space, the factory, and he has to conform to the prescribed working hours. Thus the workman is separated from his means of production and also from the results of his labour. He is merely the owner of his labouring power, which he rents out to the proprietor of the business. 'In the separation of the labourer from his product' – says the warning from Von Thünen[14] – 'lies the source of evil'. The evil manifests itself in the division of society into two more or less hostile camps. We now find, as Sombart[15] formulated so well, 'an exchange organisation, in which two different groups of the population: the owners of the production means who at the same time are the leaders, being economic subjects, and the labourer without any possession being the economic object, have to work together because they are both connected with the market, and this exchange organisation is dominated by the concept of profit and economic rationalism'.

This is the organisational form of a society that bears the stamp of capitalism. The concept of gain is the main motive of man's action. Economic principle, which is more or less inborn in man as a result of his position in relation to frugal nature, is elevated to the main principle. Max Weber[16] rightly says, that capitalism enforces on everybody, provided he has some connection with the market, the rules of its economic actions 'The producer' – he continues –, 'who continually acts against the norm, will as doubtedlessly be eliminated as the labourer who can't or won't adapt, and be turned into the street unemployed'. In the society where possession forms the foundation of the social order, a breach is made in community feeling which once was so strong. A communal sense still exists – as Van Gunstren[17] remarked – but it is founded more on the understanding that one is dependent on one another than on the awareness that one belongs together.

The capitalistic spirit in which Western European society of the 16th and 17th century was steeped, did not immediately show itself to its full extent. The concept of gain was the force behind the production process, but the urge for gain was still limited. Profit was not the ultimate object, but merely a means to achieve prosperity. And prosperity served to make life agreeable and to give its possessor an ideal life. 'All Italian merchants' books of the Renaissance' – says Sombart[18] – 'show the desire for a peaceful life in the country; the same feature, i.e. feudalising businessmen, we still find in the way of life of French, German, Dutch, English merchants of the 18th century. The ideal of feudal requirements would seem to us a common characteristic of the economic spirit of early capitalism'.

Just as the capitalist spirit as its first appearance was reminiscent of the restrictions of Medieval life, so was the state, which held the opinion that it had to continue in certain respects the tradition of the municipal economic policy. The principle of economic responsibility was accepted within the borders of the State, but towards the outside world the national community was a closed unit. At the borders, private initiative came to a stop; and there the exclusive domain of government concern began. The same task which the town authorities in the Middle Ages had set themselves for the benefit of the town community, the State now set themselves for the benefit of the national community.

Encouragement and protection of national welfare and guidance of economic expansion as a sphere of action that lay open to a young

capitalist state. And soon it was contemplating measures to stimulate the growth of national industry. Everywhere in the country industries were encouraged and roads were built. In the interest of industry the import of raw materials was encouraged and the entrance of skilled and specialised labourers was promoted. On the other hand the import of industrial products was checked. In order to check foreign trade this was monopolised and placed in the hands of chartered trading companies. It was the same system of mercantilism that has contributed so much to the education and maturing of young industrial countries. This economic policy puts the interest of the towns first which often causes the countryside to fall into the background.

Just as in the Middle Ages when the countryside was the town's territory between which there had to be an economic balance, the early capitalist states considered its colonies in the same way. The seventeenth-century colonial policy was a pure imitation of the economic policy of the Medieval town. 'The colonies existed for the mother country; their products had to be sold in the mother country in the same way as the towns in the Middle Ages had enforced on the surrounding countryside the monopoly of their markets'.[19] Between the colonies and the mother country there should not be any competition. Just as the Medieval town saw to it that the countryside did not start its own industry, just as carefully did the early capitalist state see to it that no industry appeared in the colonies. In its mind the mother country and the colonies were the one closed economic unit. An independent economic life was not granted to the colonies. Commercial relations with some other state were considered an encroachment on the concept of economic unity and were ruthlessly resisted. One should see the numerous occurrences of punitive raids and other such things in the light of these facts. With this continuation of the economic policy of the towns into the new times, there were disastrous results for the economic life of the colonies. The economic policy of balance which was designed for a small enclosed territory cannot be applied to large areas that are separated by many hundreds of miles. The harmonious exchange situation between the mother country and the colonies was by no means harmonious. The colonies were not in the first place meant as markets for industrial products but rather as sources of raw material and precious metals and luxuries. As an outlet for industrial products the colonies were not needed yet; and there was still room enough on the market in the mother country.

Thus the objective was to acquire the raw materials, the luxuries and the precious metals as cheaply as possible, and, if possible, for nothing. That is why the State that had at its disposal a colonial source of raw material had a lead in industrial production over other states that did not possess this. The modern state needed precious metal for the maintenance of mercenaries and civil servants. Since the credit trade had not yet been developed, the Government, in the interests of the defence of the country, had to have at its disposal a certain stock of precious metals. States that had no colonial goldmines were forced to conduct a policy of positive balance of trade. The export surplus would then be settled by importation of gold. The mercantile policy of dependence on gold thus cannot always be stigmatised as a confusion of money and wealth, but does have a logical and realistic foundation.[20]

From all this it is clear, that the colonial situation in the early capitalist era had nothing in common with the situation of town and village in the Middle Ages. The natural environment for the introduction of the Medieval concept of solidarity was completely lacking here. And that is why the application of the municipal economic policy in a larger context and in the framework of world trade, caused the economic destruction of the colonial community. It only served, as Treub[21] says, the national egotism of the mother country.

Thus we see how the economic balance in the relation between town and village was shattered with the introduction of early capitalism. The groupings of towns and villages and also changed. The capitalist states of that time were basically agricultural countries with an industrial tendency. In it the towns with their trade, industry and navigation economically dominated this unit. This organised unit in its turn dominated the agricultural communities of the rest if the world, in which organised centres were lacking. Thus one no longer finds the relationship in which town and village stand next to each other but an organised town-and-village union *against* an unorganised village world.

This is the economic picture that the period of early capitalism presents. The dynamic municipal economy dominated in two respects the static countryside of the whole world. In two respects, for the market of industrial products and the sources of raw materials did not coincide yet. Exchange of agricultural and mineral materials for industrial products did not exist or only to a very small extent.

In broad outline one can distinguish three economic complexes between which there was no normal interaction. The towns with their industrial and trading centre, which could stretch out their economic tentacles in all directions, the European countryside that provided the towns with food and at the same time formed the most important outlet for the industrial products of the town, and the communities outside Europe which only had significance as sources of raw materials and which did not yet count as outlets for industrial products. And to this the colonial and semi-colonial countries owe their economic and social neglect. Whereas the European and North American countryside also enjoys the fruits of economic and cultural progress, which the dynamic municipal economy has stimulated, the agricultural communities of the rest of the world which themselves have provided so many materials for the modernisation of Western European life, remain deprived of all this.

It is obvious that in such a false position a balanced economic distribution is out of the question. All surpluses converted into currency, flowed to the towns. And thus the town became the centre of wealth and at the same time of power. As its wealth increased and its economic power grew, it had no need for protective measures. And thus the time had come for the rise of modern capitalism, the introduction of which meant at the same time an *Umwertung aller Werte*. All residues of medieaval solidarity were put aside. All State interference in economic life had become undesirable. Free trade had become the 'summum bonum' of economic wisdom. A principle of economic responsibility was fully accepted both for national and international trade. The State was reduced to the position of a policeman. It had only to provide legal and national security.

The leadership of economic life falls into the hands of a new figure: the modern entrepreneur. He becomes the driving force of the capitalistic production process. Without him, says Sombard,[22] nothing gets done. All other production factors, labour and capital, are dependent on him, and will only come to life by his actions. Practical inventions too only gain significance through him.

The main point in the production process is shifted again. Now from capital to organisation, which Marshall[23] rightly regards as an independent production factor. Organisational genius has become the most important element in industry.

The capitalist owner of enterprises represents a type of man who

considers business as an end in itself. Unlike the capitalist of a previous period who wants no share for himself, the idea of living on one's means without working is foreign to his nature. He is continually trying to make 'new combinations'[24] of production factors and is continually on the look-out for new production methods, in order to enlarge the basis of his business. To achieve this he does not shrink from going against the current. No risk is too great for him. That does not mean that he feels less responsibility. For his risk is 'financial and moral'.[25] And a planned economy drags him into untraditional action, no hesitation is possible. For a man with such a restless and extremely dynamic personal joy cannot be the motive of his actions. The economic interest of his enterprise is the all-important factor. In the objectives of the capitalist employer we can see the process of what Simmel[26] calls 'the psychological growth of means into an end'. The inevitable consequence is that his actions are less often dictated by irrational motives. Objectivity and rational-economic motives are the typical characteristics of the modern capitalist period.

Just like the State, the capitalist in this period remains, unless he is at the same time the contractor, in the background. The possession of capital alone cannot any longer give him the title of a leader of economic life. The latter requires organisational powers, which not everybody can boast of. The majority of the capitalists in a narrower sense is satisfied with the passive role of calculating the interest and collecting dividends. Especially the appearance of the limited liability company has promoted the situation, in which the personal link between owner and enterprise has been completely severed. The link has become a loose and temporary one.

3

Two factors in particular have contributed to the complete change in economic life: the *individual* revolution which was stimulated by the rationalistic philosophy of the 17th and 18th Century and reached its zenith during the French Revolution of 1789; and the *industrial* revolution beginning with the invention of the steam engine which had its birth-place in England. The former led to the emancipation of the individual and the disappearance of the class system and mediaeval serfdom, the latter caused a transformation of economic and social life. The two factors are indeed closely

interconnected, because the triumph of individualism has not failed to have an influence on the economic ideas of those days. This was particularly shown in connection with the lofty principle of free exchange.

This economic individualism had Adam Smith as its prophet. Starting from the principle that each person knows his own interests best and is in the best position to further those interests, he puts forward the theory that there is a natural agreement between the particular and general interest. Guided by his self-interest the acting individual will apply himself especially to producing those goods or performing those tasks for which he has a natural aptitude. This leads to a rational division of labour which in turn leads to a natural exchange of goods and services. This will result in society acquiring products that have been produced with the least amount of trouble and difficulty, whilst the producers receive the highest possible reward for their labour and the consumer pays the lowest possible price. Thus free-acting self-interest will create of its own accord the ideal conditions in the field of production as well as that of distribution. Far from causing mischief, the individual self-interest, if left to develop on its own will create an economic harmony in society. For that reason the State must refrain from any interference with economic life. Adam Smith did not omit to give his doctrine a certain theological bearing. For it is said of the division of labour, the corner-stone of his theory, that 'it is not the result of some human wisdom'[27] but the necessary consequence of a tendency of human nature.

There is no doubt that Adam Smith does not mean to serve the cause of the capitalists with this individualism and that he means well by the lot of the common man. After all he puts forward the theory that 'society cannot really prosper and be happy if the greater part of its members live in poverty and misery'.[28] He expects much of economic individualism in raising the standard of living for the lower classes. Although he may have been mistaken in his social vision, this does not detract from his genuine concern with the poor. Perhaps his economic individualism is in a sense the good news to masses telling them to liberate themselves from the oppressive feeling of impotence bred by ages of domination by feudalism. The teachings of Adam Smith which are a plea for free social intercourse based on the natural division of labour are expanded by his brilliant pupil David Ricardo to a theory of international exchange. 'In a true free trade system' – he states[29] –

'every country of its own accord will employ its capital and labour in such a way that everyone will derive most benefit from them. The endeavour to attain individual gain is somehow connected with the universal welfare of all. By stimulating industry, by rewarding special skills and by the most efficient use of specific natural resources it distributes the available labour in the most effective and economic way. As it diffuses benefits everywhere by augmenting the general branches of production it binds all together by a communal tie of interests and relations to a universal community of nations all over the civilised world. It is this principle that determines that wine shall be made in France and Portugal, that corn shall be produced in America and Poland and that ironware and other goods shall be manufactured in England'.

The importance of free commercial exchange is that every country can specialize in producing those goods for which it is most suited because of the natural state of its soil and particular skills of its people. It is not the absolute amount of the production costs which determines the choice of goods to be produced, as Adam Smith mistakenly had thought, but the relative amount. Even a country not well endowed by Nature and which in every way has more production difficulties than other countries can still profit from international trade on condition that she applies herself to the production of those goods at which she is, in comparison, least backward. On the other hand, a country well blessed by Nature and having, in every respect, an advantage over other countries will benefit from participating in international trade if she uses her resources for producing those goods for which she is, in comparison, best equipped to produce.

Whatever one may say about the theories of Adam Smith and Ricardo,[30] the economy of the 19th Century had initially fared well by its directions. The belief in a beneficial influence of free trade was further increased by important technical inventions which, above all, gave expression to the emancipation of the mind. Application of steam power was begun on a large scale in industry and transport. Manual labour was replaced as much as possible by machines. The steam engine took the place of the horse as the main tractive power on land. At sea sailing ships were superseded by steamships. These changes enabled advantages to be achieved in three areas: efficiency in the use of labour, productive capacity and time. Thus the new economy industrialised the whole production system in a very short time and it revolutionised the whole of

society. In the centre of the social system now stands the modern business enterprise.

Whilst the early capitalistic State was an agrarian-type State with an industrial leaning, the modern capitalistic State is just the opposite: an industrial State with an agrarian leaning. When it comes to making bigger profits agriculture falls into the background. The influx to the towns is a natural result of this industrialisation process. And this ever-growing labour pool facilitates in turn the establishments of more new enterprises. This process started in England. Not till half a generation later was its example followed by France, Belgium and Germany. Since the last quarter of the 19th century the industrialisation of Europe has grown at an ever increasing rate and the process has gradually spread to America and other parts of the world. The latter is understandably an expansion of European investment particularly from Britain.[31]

This industrialisation was accompanied everywhere by a rapid increase in population. The increased birth-rates and the decrease in mortality which caused this to happen doubled the European population in less than half a century. It finally cannot adequately feed the rapidly growing population with home-grown products. This is particularly the case in Britain where agriculture is capable of sustaining the population's foodstuffs requirements for only a few months in each year.

This shortage of food is a characteristic of a modern capitalistic country. It becomes increasingly dependent on foreign agricultural countries for the necessary sustenance of its population. The non-European countries are not only important as regions for raw materials but also as granaries. In two ways they have now to be useful to the capitalistic part of the world.

As yet is was not realised that, in order to create an economic balance, these large agricultural areas have to be stimulated into becoming fully developed outlets for industrial products. Even nowadays this truth is only reluctantly admitted. If this need was realised in time the first concern would be the creation of a demand with a great capacity to buy and to activate economic life in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Instead of keeping the standard of living systematically low the purchasing power of the population should be improved by an appropriate welfare policy which must be kept in line with the development of economic life in Western Europe.

The founding of their own industry by such agrarian countries

would certainly not be against the European industrial interests. Experience has shown that this would even be beneficial to industrial activities in Europe. Only then would these vast regions have become markets with great potential and ready outlets for the products of European industries. The world as a whole would not be plagued by problems of poverty amidst abundance.

This never dawned on the economic leaders of those days. Such a purposeful economical policy aimed at a fair distribution of wealth also requires regulated backing from the State, but this did not fit the 'Laissez-faire' policy which was rife in the high capitalistic period.

Thus modern capitalism made the same mistake as its predecessor. It not only perpetuates both one-sided economic superiority and dependence but it accentuates these as well. Only the method has changed. Its action was based, in name only, on Ricardo's principle of international exchange but in practice it was quite contrary to this principle. The abstract theory of free exchange, after all, is based on the equality of countries where each can assert its economic interests to the full. This basic principle in particular was not adhered to and one neglected to take it into account when putting Ricardo's teachings into practice.

This lack of vision can partly be blamed on the fact that the rising industrialism found itself placed in a world which, from a technical point of view, was still fallow. The world of Adam Smith and Ricardo was largely a world of manufacture by manual labour, a world of stage-coaches and wooden ships, of primitive mining, of insufficiently organised finance, banking and credit systems and lastly a world where telephone, telegraphy and radio were still unknown. What miracles could these technical inventions have performed in that world! What would be more suitable for exploitation than private enterprise, borne as it is by the drive to infinity of the proprietor? Thus one only saw what existed and one only dreamt about conquering a world of unlimited possibilities, and one got on with the job in hand. Under these psychological conditions it cannot be expected that one could foresee that there would be a time when industrial production, if continued at full capacity, would reach a point at which the world would become too small. In those days prospects were governed by the contrast between seemingly unlimited sales possibilities and a never-sufficient productive capacity. A free-for-all amongst the social forces was seen as the only means to catch up. Hence the optimism which was so characteristic of all utterances in economic circles.

The technical miracle that was performed with the aid of the human brain contributed to an increase in that economic optimism. Every technological success was followed by new inventions. Every technical application opened up new vistas for improving upon existing techniques. Thus it became a race between invention and applications to realise the highest ideals.[32] At the same time the process of systematic rationalization of labour methods was started. 'Between 1800 and 1860 the acceleration of this process was such that it seemed indeed that there would be no end to the improvements to machines and the increase in human productive capacity'.[33]

The invention of steam power, with which the period of mechanical production and enormous railway construction had started, was followed by the invention of electricity with its rapid application to industry. One can consider the invention of the low voltage current and its application to telegraphy and telephone as a transition. But electricity was soon followed by the era of the petrol engine which revolutionised the whole production system once more. Particularly in the field of transport the results of this revolution can clearly be seen today. The rail-bound train now had a competitor in the motor car which opened up outlying districts and villages that had up till then been inaccessible. This was soon followed by the electric tram, the aeroplane and wireless telegraphy. At sea the motor vessel took its place beside the steamship. The imposing presence of the latter seems outdated already. With the arrival of the radio as an extension to wireless telegraphy the conquest of the 'air' nears its completion.

This perfection of means of communication opened up new markets and accelerated the rationalisation process in industry. This found expression in two respects: technically and economically.

Technical rationalisation consists of a systematic mechanisation of labour. More and more manual labour is superseded by machines. The redundant workers are re-employed as far as possible by establishing new industries where they can work. But it is clear that too fast a rationalisation creates unemployment.[34] Thus we see the curious phenomenon of the change of roles between worker and machine. In the early days the machine was man's assistant, now we can see the opposite: the worker is reduced to being the machine's assistant. With increased mechanisation the importance of the process is centred around the machine. 'In modern manufaturing and mining industry', says Prof. Mr. De Vries,[35] 'one can observe a tendency of ever-increasing expansion, connected es-

pecially with the great importance which fixed capital and therefore constant costs assume. Buildings, power plants and machines must all be attuned together to form one vast technical and economic unit capable of top performance. Thus it may become necessary to enlarge the whole organisation to arrive at the most profitable production capacity. For this and other reasons the results of the law of mass production were continually felt'.

Economically rationalisation is carried through by various enterprises combining into still larger bodies such as manufacturer's unions, trusts and giant concerns.

A manufacturer's union is created when an agreement is made between various business concerns for the duration of a definite time and with a specific purpose. Because of the temporary nature of that agreement the individual concerns retain their independence. According to the purpose of the agreement one can differentiate between production cartels, price cartels, marketing and distribution cartels etc. Here rationalisation is reached by savings on advertising and propaganda necessitated by strong competition. The cartel-type manufacturers' union is not able to eliminate competition among the associated concerns.

In a trust the associated concerns lose their independence and are completely absorbed in a new large-scale concern. It takes the form of a concentration of assets under one single management. The constituent members are only of importance as productive contributors. Therefore the trust is more capable of dominating a market than is the cartel. The trust concentration is effected either horizontally or vertically or in both ways at the same time. A horizontal concentration consists of business concerns which produce similar products. In a vertical concentration one finds concerns whose products have a linear relationship such as mining, blast furnaces and transport. The endeavour is aimed at becoming independent of other business concerns which stand between the production of the raw material and the market of the end product.

Another form of combine with a more prominent individuality is when a group of wealthy persons or banking houses take the initiative of purchasing the majority of shares in a particular range of business concerns by which the latter come completely under the influence of the former. In name these concerns maintain their independence. The individuality consists of the fact that the name of the initiator often finds expression in that of the concern.

Thus the big changes brought about by technical inventions and

their application in industry have contributed to a gradual undermining of the fundamental principles with which the 19th century started. The rise of the giant-concern movement severely crippled the *laissez-faire* system of Smith and Ricardo. 'Notwithstanding all differences in form and circumstances' Prof. De Vries notes[36] 'the essence of this phenomenon is the same: those, who initially appeared on the market independently and competed with each other, now joined together with a view to excluding or regulating the competition between them'.

Here it is verified again, that the power of facts is stronger than theory. It is true that free competition can be beneficial and stimulating, when it occurs between equal economic forces and when everyone can assert his economic interests. But real society is so differentiated that only the economically stronger forces benefit by it. Under this system the economically weak are doomed to be trampled underfoot. It they want to survive, then their only course is to make themselves strong and to take the path of concentration. Thus sooner or later free competition calls into existence its counterpart: the striving for monopoly.

Furthermore, the circumstance that modern industry operates predominantly with fixed capital of itself makes mergers necessary. As far as possible a modern capital-intensive concern will keep working at full capacity even when prices are falling. They work at a loss to avoid an even greater loss by bringing plant to a standstill. A decrease in production is not considered wise, because this would raise the cost of production per unit produced. The nature of big business means that every effort is made to increase production and sales in order to lower the production costs per unit produced. Since every firm in times of depression adopts the same business policy, the supply on the market increases instead of decreasing. As a result of this prices fall still further. And the gap between costs and price which has to be made up becomes still greater.

The struggle then hinges on who can hold out longest. As long as industrial expansion kept pace with the enormous expansion of markets and the opening up of new regions, the large amount of fixed capital was not a burden to firms. But things changed when the receptivity of the market reached its limits. Then it threatened to create trends which would continually upset the working of the price mechanism.

Since the last quarter of the nineteenth century it has been found that the regulating influence of price formation on the scope of

production has to a great extent ceased operating. Finally the colossal riches which during every depression were sacrificed to free competition opened people's eyes to the truth that big business has to live by other rules than those of the free play of social forces. So minds opened to the thought of – as Prof. De Vries tersely says – 'regulating market conditions and mutual competition by collaboration, in order to achieve a better adaptation of supply to demand'.

The constant penetration of technology into economic life has yet another effect than increasing the expansion possibilities of Western economy. It promotes the interdependence of production. Expansion and concentration in one branch of industry always has repercussions in other branches of production. As a result of this the prices of different kinds of articles will show some coherence. The price movement of a particular commodity spreads to prices of other commodities. The predominant role which iron plays in modern mechanised production has resulted in iron production having great influence on the course of production as a whole. Conversely the fluctuating course of industrial activities finds its expression in iron production. For this reason Spiethoff[37] can state that iron production is the barometer of economic activity.

Economic coherence is easy to understand when one realises that modern industrial production is carried out in three consecutive stages, namely the original production or production of raw materials, the production of the means of production and the production of the end products. The unity of production in a vertical line can easily be deduced from this. Greater activity in the industry for end products as a result, for example, of increasing prosperity, increases the demand for means of production. This causes greater activity in the industry of the means of production. This in its turn, with its increasing demand for raw materials, stimulates the production of raw materials, especially the iron industry. Conversely the exploitation of new mines, which make the raw material cheaper, can propel the increased activity via the industry of the means of production to the industry for end products. This mutual stimulation to greater activity through these three consecutive phases takes place without large intervals of time. All the processes occur synchronously. This is because capitalist production relies on the anticipation of the market. The same phenomenon is to be found with a decrease in activity in times of depression. One then sees an accumulation of concentration in production.[38]

But the coherence of production is also expressed in a horizontal line. Greater activity, for instance, in the foodstuffs industry is reflected in the industry for other consumer articles and vice versa. For every increase in industrial activity brings about a higher demand for labour, which is usually accompanied by an increase in wages. Apart from the fact that an increase in wages in one branch of industry is not without effect on the level of wages in other branches of industry, an increase in wages in itself means increased purchasing power. An increase in purchasing power of the working-classes leads to more consumption and thus to greater demand for consumer goods. And this benefits the activity of the industries which produce same. Thus an increased activity in a certain branch of industry always has a cumulative effect which goes far beyond the bounds of its own economic field. An increase or decrease in activity seldom affects industries in one direction only. The mutual connection between production and price is such that an activation of economic life develops both vertically and horizontally at the same time.[93]

In the relationship of mutual dependence of production and prices systems lies the explanation of why the fluctuating movement of economic life has an international character. Especially since 1857 the internationality of the behaviour of trade cycles has been unmistakably perceptible.

Mutual dependence is increased still further by the mechanism of credit trade. For modern industrial production is unthinkable without credit. But credit trade not only strengthens the coherence of production, but it also imparts to modern banks as credit givers and financing institutions a predominant function in the present-day production system. In economically backward countries they are even taking the initiative of setting up industrial enterprises.

Through their position as the centre of credit supply and credit demand the banks get an overall view of the credit requirements of trade and industry. Consequently they can regulate the granting of credit in such a way that bring about a maximum provision of credit with a minimum of means. And they would be fully capable of carrying out rational financing if their system were not continually upset by speculation on the stock exchange, which is inherent in the present economic system.

Yet it may be said that normally the banks have succeeded in keeping society solvent. This is possible because the capital requirements of different branches of trade and industry do not

manifest themselves all at the same time. The moment when one concern has surplus means at its disposal on which it wants to see some return usually coincides with the point in time when another concern, in the midst of its production badly needs credit. Thus means which are temporarily released can be used for the benefit of a temporary need for capital elsewhere.[40] And thus the banks can co-ordinate the production process in trade and industry by providing the optimum circulation of money. In order to finance the production process they are therefore not exclusively dependent on the savings of private individuals. They can see to it that trade and industry mutually finance each other, while they themselves make a profit out of it. Mobilising money and capital constitutes the characteristic task of banking.

Since the introduction of the modern giro system the influence of the banks on the production process has increased even more. For this system implies that substantial payments can be made without putting money into circulation. Payments in cash or in banknotes, which used to be the rule, are now reduced to transfers at the bank. Consequently the banks can now 'create something out of nothing'.[41] In order to grant credit it is no longer absolutely necessary for the bank to have at its disposal the means required in the form of money. All it has to do is to open a credit account for the benefit of the enterprise that has come to it for financial help, while the payments which the latter has to make are carried out by means of book and bank transfers. It is not difficult to see that this modern system of credit is an apt breeding-ground for unhealthy speculation. The possibility of 'creating something out of nothing' is a great temptation for the banks to grant excessive credit. And if they do this they are placing the solvency of society in danger. This is especially true for a boom period, which is particularly characterised by great activity, a strong spirit of enterprise and a boundless optimism on the part of the businessman. If that stage is carried far enough, high interest no longer deters people. On the contrary, it increases the tendency to ask for credit. Under a system of competition and pursuit of gain it would be surprising if the management of a bank could put a stop to pressure for credit. For by refusing credit it runs the risk of undermining one of the pillars of its own business. The rate of interest is the only means it can still wield to temper the urge for credit. But as stated before, this is usually without success, once industrial psychosis has taken possession of industrialists. Once the unhealthy increase in production

has set in, lured on by high prices and stimulated by initially cheap bank credit, it can no longer be checked. This only comes to an end when the phenomenon of overproduction occurs, inevitably followed by a collapse. And thus the elasticity of the credit system is part of the reason why the banks have become breeding-grounds for the modern crisis which plagues economic life at set times.

The facility of granting credit is still further promoted by the increasing concentration in banking. By means of this concentration the banks acquire a much greater economic power and they can withdraw more and more from the tutelage of the currency bank. Whereas for credit of any appreciable scope they used to fall back on the central bank, they can now usually dispense with the latter. The giro and concentration have created the situation that the influence of modern banks on the course of production has to a large extent escaped the supervision of the central monetary institution.

Thus we see that industrial technology and the modern credit system have not only given birth to large-scale industry with its potentially virtually unlimited production capacity, but have also forced economic life into the fatal grip of the industrial cycle of revival and depression.

4

From the above it is clear that the forces unleashed by the 19th century in Western Europe make economic life extremely dynamic. The capitalist economy is only conceivable with perpetual expansion. The principle on which it is based forces the industrialist to strive for a reduction in costs incessantly. And this striving faces him continually with almost insurmountable difficulties. Whilst he is compelled to reduce wages, which means a reduction in purchasing power of the labour force, his business, which is intent on enlargement, must live on precisely an expansion of the market. Hence the increase in spending power. The low purchasing power of the individual was originally more than made up for by the great increase in population and by the opening up of new markets. But this advantage was soon to disappear because of the enormous increase in production capacity.

We have seen how the industrialists tried to overcome their difficulties in marketing their products by concentration of business and enterprises. This in itself would not be adequate as a means of

compensation unless at the same time the workers organised themselves into powerful trade unions. The organised action of the workers has contributed in no small measure to the temporary solution of marketing difficulties.[42] Using their power the trade unions managed to bargain for higher wages and forced the employers to accept the regulation of the terms of employment such as working hours, security of employment, collective agreements and so forth.

For higher wages mean an increase in purchasing power and thus an increase in sales possibilities. Furthermore high wages have a cumulative effect on the improvement of the nation's prosperity. For high wages not only raise the subsistence minimum of the working classes, which in turn increases the vitality of the nation,[43] but it also procures for the former the means of sharing in culture. Thus the sales of cultural products and the means for the promotion of culture are expanded by the inclusion of the masses. This is clearly demonstrated by the greatly increasing circulation of books, by the production and sales of radios and by the higher appreciation of music and sport in countries with a relatively prosperous population.

The regulation of labour is not only an advantage to the workers, but also to the employers. It provides them with an equal basis for competition. Surprising one's competitor with sudden wages pressure and an increased tempo of work are excluded in this way. The restriction of working hours acts as a brake on the increase in production so that the saturation of the market is delayed.

But even the stabilising influence of labour organisations in the long run was neutralised by the process of rationalisation which upset the equilibrium. In the rationalisation of business and working methods, with its continual rejection of workers, industrialists have temporarily found a safety valve to remove the pressure of high wages and carry out a reduction in costs. The competition to capture the market through 'service', 'suggestion' and 'economic power'[44] is partially diverted to the mental battle to invent the best production technique. But in fact the reduction in costs by rationalisation means nothing other than a shifting of costs. The outlay on variable costs may become relatively smaller, it is true, but the overheads are increasing and industry is constantly getting 'harder'. Diversionary production – to use the term of Böhm Bawerk[45] – is getting longer. This is only advantageous to a certain extent and cannot be carried on indefinitely. Sooner or later the law of increased production and reduced profitability will assert itself. At

the same time heavy industry has to contend with the phenomenon of increasing costs.

The only way out of this dilemma is through an external expansion, i.e. expansion into other fields and a change in the orientation of production. And the need for constant expansion makes itself the more urgently felt as the potential capacity of industrial production increases. As we have seen, as things are today this is virtually unlimited. And therefore economic expansion is an indispensable factor in the modern capitalist production process.

But long before sales difficulties had become acute, expansion had begun. The nature of capitalism leads of itself in this direction. In early capitalism, too, expansion existed. But modern capitalism differs essentially in method from its forerunner.

The expansion of early capitalism took place, as we have seen, by means of trade. The production methods of the overseas territories were not interfered with. They contented themselves with supervising production and monopolising their sales outlets.

The expansion of modern capitalist economy makes deep inroads on the economic structure of the countries into which it moves. In the first place this is done by creating their own modern concerns in the midst of an agricultural world and by transferring to those areas their own rationalised production methods. Everywhere they go, they make their own environment and found capitalist enclaves in collectively organised communities. This is accompanied, moreover, by the introduction of modern means of transport and the installation of their own perfected distribution machinery. This has resulted in the springing up, in countries that formerly lacked cities, of towns with a mixed character. These are the foci of capitalist control.

Whereas in the days of the earlier capitalism dynamic and static economy were two separate entities mutually influencing each other, they are now combined into a single whole. They only differ ideologically. The capitalist firms obtain their extension into native society in the intermediate trade, partly formed of native elements, which is pushed in between the two.

Since the capitalist firms cannot operate without labour and this has to be obtained from native society, a monetary economy is forced on the latter. The calm peace of the agricultural community, mainly orientated to their own production, is rudely disturbed.

But for the rest Western capitalist concerns do not influence native methods of production. These are not geared to the capital-

ist production process, as in Europe where all business life is pervaded by the capitalist spirit, but they are left to themselves. The liberal principle of laissez-faire, which modern capitalism uses as its front, is one more argument for leaving the native economy to its own primitive ways. But expansive capitalism has its influence on economic life as a whole, because it controls all branches of trade, all relationships both internal and external. The weal or woe of the whole country has become dependent on the state of Western colonial business. The native world experiences the repercussions of the movement of trade through which colonial capitalism passes as part of the world economy. But the very circumstance that the all-powerful capitalist concerns come from outside the country and did not grow organically with the whole community in which they are situated, causes them to have a disorganising effect on social relations.[46]

Whilst Western firms only constitute outposts of the modern capitalist economy in the purely agricultural communities, it is understandable that their activity was originally almost exclusively orientated to the needs of the world market. They specialised in the production of specific colonial products to which European soil is ill suited. Soil suitability and climatological circumstances determined the choice of the goods to be produced. This is why western colonial business groups right from the beginning each had more or less a position of monopoly. Agricultural industry and mining form the essential parts of the colonial capitalist economy. It was only later that attention was paid, on a secondary basis, to providing industrial consumer articles for the native world. But that was only after European industries had discovered in the native world an outlet for their products.

This form of expansion, with the transfer of their own rationalised firms to a foreign agricultural world, could be called the expansion of *production capacity*. Even colonial production was tackled in a capitalist manner. The firms are mostly managed from the mother country. This results in the geographical separation of the headquarters of the firm and the actual location of the business. Though the latter cannot be removed from its operating territory, its organisational top layer, the enterprise, is preferably established in one of the main cities of the mother country, in the centre of the commercial and money market. However far expansion stretches, the city in the mother country holds the reins of economic power firmly in its own hands.

The separation of the headquarters of the enterprise and the location of the business is not specifically colonial. This also happens frequently in Europe.[47] With regard to colonial business life this separation is characteristic insofar as it is, as it were, a cast of the idea that the colony is purely a territory for exploitation. For decades this principle has left its mark on the economic policy of the colony. This separation also constitutes the channel along which economic drainage takes place. Of the millions' worth of profit produced only a very small part remains in the colony, whilst the bulk of it flows directly to the mother country.

In the second place, the expansion of capitalism takes place in the form of the export of capital which is seeking to invest in the young developing countries. These countries are poor in capital. For the capital they need for exploiting their mines, for founding all kinds of industrial firms, for building connecting roads and harbour installations, for these and many more they are dependent on the financial centres of the capitalist countries. This export of capital could be called the expansion of *financial capital*, in which banks in particular play a leading role. This expansion is carried out only to a small extent in the form of cash or gold. For the greater part it takes place through the export of capital goods, such as machinery, building materials, transport means and so forth which all benefit the national industry of the country exporting the capital. This is clearly shown by the fact that before the world war London over a period of years exported £ 200 million worth of new capital per annum. All this was managed with a gold basis at the Bank of England which on an average amounted to no more than £ 10 million.[48] This would not have been possible if capital expansion were carried out in the form of money.

The colossal amounts which flowed back every year to the countries providing the capital in the form of interest and dividends are only partially directly spent. A considerable part of it is invested again in productive enterprises and in government securities, both at home and abroad. In this way producion capacity and financial capital are continually enlarged. When the consumer power of the world community does not increase at the same time and at the same rate there occurs an economic disproportion which may be of a very severe kind. The dualism of static and dynamic economies, of village and town, within the framework of the nineteenth-century order with its lofty principle of free trade, is a continuing source of economic disturbance. Moreover, agricultural production,

because of its organic nature, is not capable of expanding rapidly. And its expansion potential is tied to definite limits, although these have not yet been reached by a long way. Thus when the inorganic industrial production, with which it should have actually stood in an equal relationship, experiences unrestrained expansion, then the danger of a chaotic disproportion is very real.

Which of the two expansion currents will make itself felt more strongly at a given moment cannot be indicated in a few words. It depends on how the native elements of the awakening communities react to it. If they have a long-established tradition and if their society is firmly based on the idea of collectivity, then initially the expansion of the production capacity will exert the stronger influence. Then the expansion of the financial capital can only be regarded as a secondary phenomenon. One can clearly observe this in almost all colonial countries of Asia. As regards areas in which the native element does not have much power of resistance, and is quickly suppressed by the colonising whites, then the expansion of financial capital will prevail. The white elements turned native become the standard bearers of industrial activity. This phenomenon is to be seen to a striking degree in the United States of America. Here they soon organised the methods of production in accordance with capitalist axioms. Local tradition did not act as a brake on production. Furthermore, the circumstance that the American people originated from the class of emigrants who had broken the ties with their mother countries and therefore were not hereditarily burdened with one tradition or another, made them accessible to innovations. And to this we may attribute the fact that later on everything new came from America. 'On virgin soil, which is not occupied by obsolete firmly-rooted social growths – says J. Huizinga[49] – economic factors act with freedom and immediacy which is unknown in European history'.

Where the intitiative for the industrial development of the country originated from the native element, Western Europe could content itself with the position of provider of capital. England in particular took the lead in this. And the unparalleled pace at which the Americans introduced the capitalist method of production could only be to Europe's advantage originally. The more rapidly industrialisation developed, the greater was the flow of capital to the New World. In the long run the capital invested assumed such formidable proportions that before the Great War the United States were usually referred to as an economic colony of Europe.

The old world could specialise in the production of capital goods and in the supply of financing credit. Thus an inexhaustible source of income was created for its population. Moreover it could also rely on the constant flow of interest payments.

But the new world was not left without a profit either. With the imported capital goods and sums borrowed it has been able to exploit its rich economic sources and has brought its industrial equipment to such a pitch of perfection that as early as the end of the last century it had surpassed Europe in many respects. From being the disciple of Europe in the application of industrial technology, America soon became its master. But also in the organisation of undertakings and business it soon overtook Europe. America has become the classic country of trust concentrations. And concentration of firms is followed by business mergers,[50] only to lead, where necessary, to clearing the ground for disintegration.[51] All activity and planning are characterised by mechanical mobility and ease of adaptation to the demands of the moment.

The development of American industrial activity greatly benefits by an unprecedented increase in population. In less than a century the population has increased from 4 million to 100 million souls. In this colossal growth is reflected the economic advantage that Europe also enjoys as the supplier of capital and credit.

Without the rise of America the expansion of European capitalism would long ago have reached its limits and would have been forced to look in new directions. The rise of the British Dominions after America in the industrial field also helped to broaden the expansion horizon somewhat. But despite this, at the beginning of the century one could already witness phenomena which pointed to shrinking horizons.

The United States themselves have become a capitalist country par excellence. Over the years they have formed enough capital to be able to afford the luxury, in addition to financing their own industrial activity, of economic expansion in Central and South America. Especially Mexico and the Argentine rapidly fell into the clutches of Yankee capitalism. In addition the young American capitalism did not have to contend with the phenomena of fossilisation as did European capitalism. Unlike Europe, which is divided into so many states, America with its much smaller population has a much larger area to itself, which moreover is rich in minerals and water power. There is no real class war, for the formation of classes has not yet been completed.[52] The system of small-

holdings, like feudal ownership on a large scale, with which Europe still has to contend, is not known in America. All this, added to the lack of tradition, makes the application of mechanical production to agriculture pre-eminently easy. This process is still further promoted by the aversion of the American to working on the land. The town holds all the promise for the future. There are quite a few examples of labourers or paper-boys or bank clerks becoming millionaires in record time.

Even before the Great War it was obvious that the old European capitalism would have to yield its American expansion territory to the young Yankee capitalism. This had the advantage that the struggle would take place on its own national territory. One economic weapon with which to fight the would-be competitor was obvious. Despite its aversion to all tradition, America was busy creating tradition in one respect, i.e. its attachment to protection. Born and bred under protection, the American economy would like nothing better than to live on with protection. In the protection of the high level of wages the common front of labour and capital favours the protectionist policy. Initially this was only employed in respect of consumer articles. But it could be extended to capital goods. And this would hit old Europe hard. The weak position of Europe as compared with America was that the latter exported predominantly raw material and agricultural produce, which Europe could not do without. The economic war would have been embittered and dangerous, had not another circumstance arisen which rendered the victory of American capitalism painless: the world war.

As a result of the war Europe was forced to devote all its energies to the production of armaments. Not only was the greater part of the existing industrial plant converted to munitions, but also new firms were developed to satisfy the demands created by the war. The allied forces had had to make an appeal to the United States for this. The previously borrowed capital flowed back to Europe in all kinds of forms, increased by new amounts which Europe in its own turn borrowed from America.

When the world war was over, European capitalism had to face completely new problems. Instead of creditor, old Europe has become the debtor of America. The flow of interest on which it could rely before was replaced by interest and payment obligations in the opposite direction. While they were saddled with an overproduction of means of production, which could not be employed satis-

factorily, once the production of armaments had stopped, the European market was flooded with American goods. 'The characteristic of the leading industrial country – remarks Somary[53] is always its predominance in the field of new branches of production. In all questions of the telephone system, of radio, of motoring and of films the United States are in the lead. Before the war the United States were the main importers of cars. At present they are the world's largest manufacturers'. Furthermore, as against the greatly increased industrial equipment there is the impoverished population and narrowing markets. The previous economic units are torn apart by the foundation of new states, which stand on economic independence. Everywhere there is the desire for autarky, for economic self-sufficiency. Every country, even the agriculturally orientated ones, are coming up with their own industries. Tariff walls are thrown up to protect them against older and stronger competitors. And thus heavy industry, intended to produce for the world market, is mainly tied to the national market.

The vast Russian territory, which promised unlimited possibilities of expansion to European capitalism, has torn itself away ideologically and economically from Europe. It forms a world on its own and is building up its economy by means of internal financing, which requires incredible sacrifice from its people. Only the alluring ideal gives it the force to endure all kinds of deprivations and to bear the oppressive state control with patience.

Furthermore, the extra-European sales markets, which before the war had received much less attention than they deserved and which could not be looked after during the war, had been lost almost entirely. Japan, which had worked its way up from a state of feudalism to that of an industrial/capitalist country, has conquered the East Asian, America the South American markets.

Thus all the troubles and problems which European capitalism had to solve loomed up at once. The idea that they could escape this deadlock by increasing their capacity for competition led to further measures of rationalisation. Thus we come to a field where Western thinking has not reached the end of its capacity. A new, larger-scale industrial revolution is coming into being, but also with the fatal consequence of mass unemployment. Even the increase in the variety of articles and the creation of new fashions and needs cannot avert this evil. Instead of offering an escape the new way only provides fertile soil for the growth of fascism, of which the newly arisen white-collar proletariat are the standardbearers.[54]

Thus modern capitalism within a period of scarcely three-quarters of a century has given rise to two noteworthy reactions. The industrial revolution through machinery gave birth to proletariat socialism. The industrial revolution by rationalisation has called forth fascism. For the moment capitalism in Europe is regressing. Shouts of 'back to the land' are ringing out louder and louder. Even in England, the classic country of free trade, they are paying more attention to the question of agriculture and 'safeguarding' is increasingly becoming the slogan of economic policy. Finally the problem of a planned economy has become a burning one.

At first there appeared to be prospects for expansive productivity. Its operational basis, unlike that of financial capital, was actually strengthened by war conditions. This applied particularly to agriculture. England, cut off from continental sugar supplies, bought up sugar on the colonial markets. The Javanese sugar industry which previously had only sold on the oriental market, was the first to benefit. 'Before the war', wrote E. Helfferich,[55] 'the Dutch East Indies were in danger of agricultural overproduction'. 'For the East Indies', he continued, 'the war, far from being a disruptive influence, became a promotive and constructive force, and in retrospect one may even claim that in spite of bringing threats and fear, damage and humiliation to the colonies, the war also saved the Dutch East Indies from a crisis and raised them to a level they could not possibly have reached otherwise at a similar pace'. He estimated the entire export surplus of the years between 1915 and 1920 at approximately 3.3 thousand million guilders, of which more than 2 thousand million were pure war profits, $1^1/_4$ thousand million being contributed by sugar.[56]

The Javanese sugar industry was able to exploit its opportunities because it was in a much stronger position than its potential rivals. This was due to its excellent equipment,[57] the natural suitability of the soil, and cheap native labour. In terms of the nineteenth century principle of free trade, its position was impregnable, and is was likely to retain the place it had gained on the world market.

But the changed economic outlook of the post-war period with its drastic protectionism, frequently accompanied by economic nationalism, sharply illuminates the weaknesses of the Javanese sugar industry. It was geared for export, for supplying world markets. Now that these markets are largely blocked, its competitive strength is of little avail. There seems to be no prospect of the markets being re-opened. Nearly every country is endeavouring

to produce sugar for its own consumption. There are no great difficulties to overcome since sugar production is not limited to a tropical climate. Only in scientific equipment, particularly in methods of selection of the product to be grown is there much leeway to make up. But here it is possible to make full use of the pioneering work of the Javanese sugar industry. Without Government support in the form of an international convention such as was concluded in London last year, the Javanese sugar industry would find it difficult to keep going.[58]

These marketing problems do not only concern sugar, but also other, specifically colonial, agricultural and mining products. They are highlighted in the growing number of international conventions dealing with production control or restriction. As yet, it is true, there are only four of these, viz. for tin, rubber, tea, and sugar, but who is to say there will not be others? There is overproduction everywhere, and colonial capitalism too is suffering from overcapacity. It cannot escape the symptoms of stagnation that are in evidence all over the world. A dark curtain will soon come down on the splendid prospects men thought they could glimpse just after the war. A fog hangs over the colonial capitalist landscape.

Economic expansion has come to a halt all over the capitalist world. Difficulties are piling up as a result. The evil is rooted in the imbalance between productive capacity and consumer strength. After a period of tremendous expansion, capitalism has become emprisoned in its own world which is 'densely populated'. with heavy industry, and 'overpopulated' with unemployed. Unemployment relief by initiating public works has been recommended as a means of creating fresh purchasing power and marketing opportunities. This public works policy certainly provides a solution, but no more than a temporary one. It is only important as a stimulus towards setting the entire machinery of economic activity in motion. But if the machinery is reluctant to function as a result of non-economic causes, a public works economy does not in itself prove very productive. Hence we find a resistance to this new economic experiment which is hard to overcome and which is reinforced by the fact that people are accustomed to operating on a profit basis. Through lack of expansion, some form of salvation is ultimately sought in the production on an unparalleled scale of armaments. And so we see how capitalism, originally a most productive force, has become the prime example of an unproductive system. It now seems as if productive work can only commence

after the destruction of the community's property and cultural values and of thriving human lives.

Whilst capitalism lies emprisoned in its own world, there exists next door to it a self-sufficient agricultural community of immense size, with a population of nearly a thousand million. i.e. more than half the inhabitants of this planet. Present output would be less than adequate if they were to be provided with the products of Western civilization, but owing to centuries of neglect this world has become inaccessible. In its heyday, capitalism regarded that immense self-sufficient area as negligible, although, on the other hand, its penetration of certain parts has been socially destructive rather than the opposite. In the words of Boeke, capitalism ripped out social supports without substituting new ones. The threatened communities are driven to defend themselves with the means at their disposal. They find strength in passive resistance. From the Urals to the Pacific and in the island world of Indonesia, the peasant finds compensation for his impotence in the face of a modern, organised economy in the denial of his products. In India, under the leadership of Gandhi, this is becoming the deliberate economic policy of the village. The ultimate consolation for economic inferiority is found in the native culture's mystic outlook on life.

In this way, over the centuries, town and village developed their respective dynamic and static economic systems. The village has remained true to itself, except for the instability brought in from outside by urban economy. Village economy has no history, in the same way that the countryside itself usually has no history.[59] But its ultimate strength lies in this self-sufficiency. Because of its dynamic spirit and unceasing expansion, the city has a long history. But is has finally become trapped in its own structure whence it is finding it hard to escape.

Having started as the generator of world economy, the city has finally brought world society to a point where it is difficult still to think in such universal terms. There is no trace of the kind of society Adam Smith and Ricardo envisaged as resulting from the blessings of modern economy. Each group lives its own life enclosed in its own system. Want lives cheek by jowl with abundance. Besides this, people are separated by ideologies. Urban economy which had started to break through the restrictive barriers of the Middle Ages, has gone full circle and come back to closed systems that are mightier in scale than ever before.

On the basis of economic outlook and ideology, world society may be divided into the following groups. Firstly, there is the fully-fledged capitalist group with liberal tendencies, represented by the countries of Western and Northern Europe and by the United States of America. In spite of representing the same system, they have no common commercial policy. England and several of the smaller countries within the group are by nature free-trade-minded. Only when forced either by prevailing unemployment or the miserable state of agriculture have they turned to protective measures such as restricting production, supporting agriculture, and all kinds of crisis measures of a semi-permanent kind. These measures are reflected in the colonies. An ever-increasing body of opinion even wishes to see a neo-mercantilistic policy applied to the economic relations between the mother country and its colonies. This is certainly not in the interest of the colony with its need for a versatile approach. But such a mentality is indeed characteristic of over-capitalisation. France, where industry and agriculture maintain a balance, is always biased in favour of more than just moderately protectionist tariffs. The United States, despite their high-capitalist nature, are ever inclined towards protectionism.

Secondly, there is the semi-capitalist and young capitalist group to which the countries of Eastern Europe, parts of Central and South America and the British Dominions belong. In most of these countries agriculture has a slight edge on industry, the principal reasons being the vastness of the country and the lack of population. They are extremely protectionist-minded.

The third, fascist group is characterised by the predominating influence of the state on economic life. The fascist system is a mixture of capitalism and feudalism. Which of the two is paramount depends on the measure of capitalist maturity. The capitalist trend predominates in Germany and Italy. The feudal aspect constitutes the complementary element required to carry through vertical planning. In Japan, on the other hand, the feudal tendency is more pronounced – understandably so, in the light of its rapid development. In economic policy, this feudal and capitalist nature is expressed in a striving towards economic self-sufficiency, and colonies must be instrumental in this. Hence we witness the colonial imperialism these countries initiate whatever the cost may be. In economic policies, economic considerations play a subordinate part. The irrational dominates every action in every field.

Fourthly, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics constitutes a

separate world of its own. Because of the enormous size of its territory and the richness of its soil, it can satisfy all the conditions for an autarctic society. An attempt is being made at developing an entirely separate economic world. Socialist development is still in the stage of state capitalism. This, apparently, is essential owing to the lack of any firm capitalist planning in Tsarist Russia. All economic plans are based on the calculation of profitability.[60] Economic life is controlled by the state. Foreign trade is a state monopoly. Commercial policy is therefore highly protectionist.

To complete this general picture of the present economic state of the world, we may mention a fifth group, that of the world's vast countryside with almost a thousand million souls, a group characterised by self-sufficiency and lack of any system.

If we survey the entire scene, it is clear what an unbalanced picture the world economic structure presents. Harmony and economic balance in mutual relations are nowhere to be seen. The elements which ought to create such harmony do not exist. World economy cannot be saved by slogans of free trade or protectionism. Differences in commercial policies are intersected by the clash of ideologies. Supporters of the doctrine of free trade are few in number. Whereas the older protectionists base their opinions on the economic interests of the entire community, the protectionist mentality of the totalitarian states evolves from the basic principles of their economic system which is aimed at self-sufficiency.

World economy can only be saved by *planning* international economic relations. In the second part of this article we analysed the medieaval community and argued that a closed society is dependent on a planned economy. Now that the economy of national states is approaching that of a closed society, internal and external planning is unavoidable. There is planning everywhere, but it is faulty and lacks foresight so that its purpose, i.e. to create a balance and a harmony of interests, is not achieved. But what has not been done yet, may still be achieved, particularly if rational economic understanding gets the better of the deeply rooted liberal tradition, and if a sense of harmony succeeds in ousting egoism.

Since internal planning cannot exist without external protectionism, it is obvious that some arrangement must be made whereby national communities may render each other economic assistance. So long as the world's riches are widely dispersed and not everything is available everywhere, each country must, on pain of im-

poverishment, remain dependent on international exchange. The point is how exchanges between more or less closed systems can be arranged, whilst taking their ideologies into account. Such a settlement can only be effected if it is clearly realised that under present conditions, international exchange cannot exist without planning. Foreign trade urgently requires planning so that the bad odour adhering to a defensive, protectionist policy can be neutralised. It cannot be achieved without international consultation. An international conference, however, which cannot find anything better to do than deal with tariffs, is doomed to failure in the context of the present state of economic affairs. Nor can any results be achieved by the discussion of monetary problems. The object of an international economic conference must be the fixing of each country's share in the production and consumption of certain goods. In addition, the agricultural territories must be given an opportunity to increase their consumer strengt by building up their economic life on the basis of their social structure and with the aid of modern methods.

We reached this conclusion after analysing the main features of the economic world structure. It does not pretend to provide an ultimate solution for the economic problems of world society. Those problems are indissolubly connected with other political, and colonial problems, all of which affect the structure of the world. This article was merely an attempt at casting some light on certain economic aspects.

Reprinted from the monthly *Sin Tit Po*, 1938, nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9.

1. *De oorzaken der werkloosheid en de middelen ter bestrijding* (speech held at the beginning of 1936), p. 34.
2. Here we take Middle Ages measured by the standard of European history. For strictly speaking one could also distinguish the Greek Middle Ages, Indian Middle Ages etc. From a social-philosophical point of view one uses the term Middle Ages as the indication of a period, in which the theological aspect dominated social life.
3. *Der moderne Kapitalismus I*, Vol. I, p. 47.
4. Compare among others Oswald Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, II, p. 108.
5. In his excellent study of 'Die Sozialen Gründe des Untergangs der antiken Kultur', (reprinted in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, pp. 289-311) Max Weber explains how cultural Antiquity was brought to ruin by the disappearance of the town. Cultural Antiquity is basically a *town* culture. The town was the centre of political life, of art and literature. Economically it responded to what one would now call a 'town'. A town in the Hellenic period of Antiquity was basically not very different from the town of the Middle Ages. Just as in the Middle Ages, there existed

trade between the town and the country. Because of social conflicts, and in particular the increasing application of slavery which undermined the town's economy, the town disappeared. *Culture became national.* Max Weber concludes his contemplation with:

'The cycle of economic development of Antiquity has been completed. Apparently its spiritual labour has been completely destroyed. With trade many other things disappeared too, the marble splendour of the ancient towns and all the spiritual goods that they contained; art and literature, science and the subtle rules of ancient etiquette ... Thus the warm remains of ancient culture and the spiritual life of Western man disappeared into eternal night ... But it merely hibernated, just as culture in general, in the lap of the economic life that had turned national again. And it was not awoken by the love-songs and tournaments of feudal society. And it was only when on the basis of free labour division and transport, the town arose again in the Middle Ages, and when the transition to a national economy prepared civic freedom and the intimacy between the external and internal authorities of the feudal era disintegrated, then the old giant arose again with new powers and there was a revival of the spiritual inheritance of antiquity in our modern bourgeois culture'.

6. We are only considering the town here from an economic point of view. One can obviously also consider it from more than one point of view. From a sociological viewpoint we would like to refer to Max Weber, 'Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft', which forms Part III of his *Grundriss der Sozialökonomik*, Vol. 2, pp. 515-601. Some interesting remarks about the strength of the power of the town can be found for instance in Jose Ortega y Gasset, *The Rebellion of the Masses*, p. 191 *et sqq.* Sprengler too has expressed his bold conception on the same subject in his work mentioned above, pp. 101-131. It is important though that one should read this work very critically.
7. A fine description of the so-called *risk-culture* can be found in the treatise of Professor Dr. Alfred Von Martin, 'Kultursoziologie der Renaissance', in *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, p. 506 *et sqq.*
8. *Die Nationalökonomie der Gegenwart und Zukunft und andere gesammelte Schriften*, p. 343. A more thorough analysis of the influence of money on the mind of man and on culture can be found in the work of Georg Simmel, *Philosophie des Geldes.* From pages 234-235 we quote the following:

   'The fundamental polarity of the nature of money; the fact that money **is** the only way to exist, which psychologically makes it the absolute *aim* in life for most people, has strangely changed it to a kind of symbol, which has, as it were, lost sight of the basic demands of daily living. We should treat life in such a way, as if every minute were an objective, every minute should be taken this seriously, as if life had really progressed thus far for the sake of this moment; and at the same time we should live in such a way as if none of its moments were an end, we should not attach any value to any of them, but only use every minute as a thoroughfare and means to higher and ever higher levels. This apparently contradictory view of every moment of life, on the one hand definitive and on the other hand transitory, springs from the depth of our inner life, in which the soul determines its relationship with life- and finds strangely enough, as it were an ironic satisfaction in money, which is the most superficial outpost of the mind, because it is so devoid of all qualities and grandeur'.
9. Spengler, *op. cit.*, pp. 601-610.
10. *Der moderne Kapitalismus I*, Vol. I. p. 36.
11. Compare Dr. A. V. Martin, 'Kultursoziologie der Mittelalters', in the *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, p. 374.

12. Compare among others Mr. M. W. F. Treub, *Hoofdstukken uit de geschiedenis der Staathuishoudkunde*, Ch. 1.
13. The word 'material' one should not take as 'physical' but in the sense of the legal use in the distinction of 'material' and 'formal'.
14. *Der isolierte Staat*, p. 600.
15. Sombart, *op. cit.*, p. 319.
16. 'Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus', included in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, Part I, p. 37.
17. *Kalvinismus und Kapitalismus*, p. 214.
18. *Der moderne Kapitalismus II*, Vol. I, p. 56.
19. Mr. Treub. See p. 40. Compare also Sombart (Part I, Vol. I), p. 430 *et sqq.*
20. See among others Lewis H. Haney, *History of Economic Thought*, p. 109 *et sqq.*
21. Treub, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
22. *Der moderne Kapitalismus III*, Vol. I, p. 12.
23. *Principles of Economics*, 8th ed., p. 138 *et sqq.* Compare also pp. 311-313.
24. Joseph Schumpeter, *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*, p. 111 *et sqq.*
25. M. J. H. Cobbenhagen, *De verantwoordelijkheid in de onderneming*, p. 51.
26. *Philosophie des Geldes*, p. 233.
27. *The Wealth of Nations*, Edition Everyman's Library, Vol. 1, p. 12.
28. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
29. *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, Gonnor, p. 114.
30. In spite of its shortcomings, the influence of Ricardo's theory is shown by the fact that the best work written in recent years about international trade, Prof. Ohlin's *Interregional and International Trade*, however different in intention and conception it may otherwise be, reaches a conclusion very much like Ricardo's. It can be regarded as an extension to the classical theory based on the 'mutual-independence theory of pricing' instead of on the untenable 'labour cost and value theory'.
31. See Achille Viallate, *L'impérialisme economique*, p. 109 *et sqq.*
32. See Dr. Ir. A. Korevaar, *Techniek en Wereldbeschouwing*, p. 117 *et sqq.*
33. Ir. Ernst Hymans, 'De Overschatting der Machine'; a contribution inserted in Prof. Volmer's commemorative book *Van Boekhouden tot Bedrijfsleer*, p. 202.
34. Otto Bauer, *Goede en verkeerde Rationalisatie.*
35. Some observations on legal arrangements concerning business combines, recommendations included in the report of the 19th Accountants' Meeting of the Netherlands Institute of Accountancy, p. 7.
36. De Vries, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
37. In his treatise 'Krisen' in the *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, Vol. VI, p. 18 *et sqq.*
38. This cumulative process is clearly illustrated in the preliminary advice of Prof. Goudriaan to the Vereniging voor de Staathuishoudkunde en de Statistiek, concerning the question: 'Can we expect in this country, even after an improvement in the economic conjuncture, a permanently increased level of unemployment etc.', p. 11 *et sqq.*
39. An insight into this mutual connection has led to the fact that nowadays because of the alarming level of unemployment people are more and more preoccupied with seeking a suitable starting-point to get bogged-down industrial activity moving again. More and more people are coming to see, despite a rigidity of mind, that a solution to the problem can be found in undertaking public works in a time of depression. The financial consequence, however, which is inseparable from a politicy of public works, forces one to calculate to what extent increased employment spreads. The degree of multiplication is now called the 'multiplier'.

    This new problem posed in the economy is expounded inter alia in Keynes,

The General Theory of Employment, interest and money, p. 11 *et sqq.* See also Dr. J. J. Polak, *Publieke werken als vorm van de conjunctuurpolitiek.* Imbued with the same spirit, but written in a more popular style and more propaganda-oriented, is the well known Plan of Labour of the S.D.A.P. and the N.V.V.

40. Cf. Prof. Dr. N. J. Polak, *Enige grondslagen voor de financiering der onderneming*, 4th ed., p. 186 *et sqq.*
41. Joseph Schumpeter, *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*, p. 109.
42. The ex-Prime Minister of Britain, Lord Baldwin, recently pointed out in a speech to a women's scientific institute in Cheltenhem that 'in the present phase of industrial development, industrial slavery and chaos would reign if there were no trade unions'. And he was speaking first and foremost not as a statesman, but as an ex-employer. (Quoted in *Het Volk*, 19th July 1938, morning edition).
43. Regarding the influence of wages on the vitality of a nation, accrueing to posterity, see Marshall, *Principles of Economics*, pp. 560, 562 *et sqq.*
44. Cf. Sombart, *Der moderne Kapitalismus III*, Vol. II, p. 556 *et sqq.*
45. *Kapital und Kapitalzins,part II*, Vol. I, p. 107 *et sqq.*
46. As far as Java is concerned, this is confirmed more than once by Prof. J. H. Boeke, inter alia in his *Auto-activiteit naast autonomie* (p. 53) and in his *Dualistische economie* (p. 11).
47. Important studies are devoted in the literature of business economy to the location of industry. One of the best known is that by Alfred Weber, *Über den Standort der Industrien.*
48. See Sir George Paish, 'Commercial Policy of the Gold Standard', in the *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science* of April 1934, p. 83 *et sqq.*
49. *Mens en menigte in Amerika*, p. 4.
50. See Prof. Dr. C. A. Verrijn Stuart, *Hoofdtrekken van de leer der maatschappelijke voortbrenging*, p. 195.
51. Cf. Mr. P. Lieftinck, *Moderne structuurveranderingen der industrie in de Verenigde Staten van Amerika*, p. 17.
52. Felix Somay, *Wandlungen der Wirtschaft seit dem Kriege*, p. 49 *et sqq.*
53. Somary, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
54. The prognosis of Marx, that the proletarianisation of society will result in strengthening proletarian class-consciousness, has not been borne out by events. For although rationalisation depopulates the factory, at the same time it populates the offices. New staff has to be taken on to cope with the more complicated work of administration. In his *Opbouwend Socialisme* p. 152) Hendrik De Man makes the following remark:
'It is a fact that the majority of clerks will cling to the outward and ideological characteristics of a bourgeois or at least unproletarian class consciousness, as the tendency towards economic proletarianism increases. For clerks feel that the fate against which they are defending themselves means that they will be reduced to the level of the proletariat, and it is precisely for this reason that they fight with a desperation that reminds one of somebody who is about to fall into an abyss. It is typical of a member of the white-collar proletariat that he does not want to belong to that proletariat, the less so, the more he already is. What applies to the white-collar proletariat applies even more so to those strata of the actual middle class (especially of the old middle class of independent small businessmen and civil servants) who of old measured the height of their social status and of their social feeling of self-esteem by the vertical distance which separated them from the industrial proletariat as the lowest rung on the social ladder. And here too the resistance to sinking into the proletariat and thus to being indentified

with it becomes more desperate as the pressure of an economic proletariat increases. The hate against Marxism is therefore the ideological symbol of this resistance, just as the anti-capitalist slogans are the ideological symbol of the resentment against the wealthy upper strata'.

55. *Die Wirtschaft Niederländisch-Indiens im Weltkriege und heute*, p. 7.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
57. See details in H. Ch. J. Van Der Mandere, *De Javasuikerindustrie in heden en verleden.*
58. Cf. articles by Prof. J. Van Gelderen, 'De internationale suikerconventie', in the *Economisch-Statische Berichten* of 19th May 1937, and H. J. Broekveldt, 'De Nederland-Indische crisismaatregelen', in *De Economist* of June 1937.
59. Cf. Oswald Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes, II*, p. 594.
60. Cf. among others G. Grinko, *Le plan quinquennal.* More interesting in this context are the observations of the Editor of *The Economist*, Michael Farbman, 'The reconstruction of Soviet Russia'.

5 The objectives and policy of the national movement in Indonesia

FOREWORD

When the Secretary of your Association invited me to give a speech about the nationalist movement in Indonesia, it soon became apparent to me how difficult this task was going to be. The difficulty became more and more apparent as I worked out the framework of my speech. The problems I have to talk about appear like a range of mountains in front of me, all of varying shapes and colours, so that it will be quite impossible for me to deal with it fully in merely one speech.

It will soon be clear to you all that the nationalist movement in Indonesia is not merely a single movement of great size, but, rather like the situations occurring in other countries, it is divided into a number of different associations, each of which has its own form and its own characteristics.

I thought the easiest way to set out my thoughts in regard to this problem would be as follows. First of all to tell you about the various associations, one by one, describing how they came into being and what is their own background, and also discussing the tactics and policies and the programmes put forward by each one of them. When these points have been clearly explained, I should then give you some views regarding the P.P.P.K.I. and tell you about the part played by this in the Indonesian independence movement of today. After this the speaker should really give you a general overall picture so that the audience will understand what is really meant by the nationalist movement of Indonesia. The various forms and various shades of opinion contributed by each organisation and its policy would have to be described and then a general synthesis would have to show how these merged into a single body.

But how can all this be done in so short a space of time? A picture of this kind could form the contents of a very thick volume.

And there is also another difficulty which is quite as large as the one I have just mentioned. Anyone who tries to analyse the problem of colonial rule can never do so divorced from his own politics and beliefs. There is no problem today which can so easily lead one into partiality as the problem of colonialism. This difficulty is one which makes things extremely hard for me because I am a politician who has his own convictions and follows the stream of national policy known as non-cooperation. Yet in a speech of this kind it is my duty to give you my views very objectively. What I mean by 'objective' is not that you would have to agree with me later on but that I would have to be partial according to the standards on the Indonesian side. This means that I have to state the feelings of all Indonesian nationalists, in all their various forms and shades of opinion and I ought to show you every political point of view which forms part of the Indonesian nationalist movement.

When I saw what all the difficulties were and I found that time was running short, I suddenly decided that it would be best for me to use an analytical approach when speaking to your meeting. This means that now my speech is devoted to the objectives and policy of the Indonesian nationalist movement.

I have even given a little thought to the problem as to whether it is even permissible to talk of nationalism in Indonesia, when the movement is not a single body and does not assume one form or one shade of opinion. My answer to this was that it is permissible because however much the form and shades of opinion of the parties with nationalistic tendencies may differ, all of them are aimed towards the achievement of a Free Indonesia.

And it is this objective, this freedom of the nation, which can be seen to be the same for every group. The differences in opinion and in points of view become evident when one considers the methods and means to be used to achieve the common goal. Unfortunately, however widely the convictions and political persuasions of the various groups may differ and however great the difference in their tactical approach, all these groups can be divided into two large classes: those who have a policy of cooperation with the government and those who have a policy of non-cooperation.

The result of this is that my speech has to be divided into three main sections.

1. OBJECTIVES

Anyone who studies the independence movement in Indonesia should not suppose that the movement is a movement which stands all on its own and has no relationships with events occurring all over the world. Such a supposition would be wrong. Even though Indonesia is separated from the outside world because it is hemmed in by water all the way round, the spiritual and political life of the inhabitants is not free from the modern influences of a new era which have now penetrated into the Asian continent. Therefore it is necessary for us to regard the Indonesian movement as a link in a long chain, a part which cannot be separated from all the political and social events which are shaking the world today and are giving shape and colour and meaning to what is now generally known as 'the rise of the Eastern nations'.

It is hardly necessary to say that there are many idealist writers who have asserted that the twentieth century was born to the accompaniment of an 'Eastern renaissance', the awakening of the coloured peoples.

Before I set out the main burden of my speech, I will try to say a little bit regarding the relationships between the nationalist movement in Indonesia and similar movements in neighbouring countries.

Up to the end of the nineteenth century, practically everybody held the view that coloured people were created for the purpose of being slaves and were intended to remain the peoples of colonised countries. During that period the greatness of the white races was not to be questioned, nor was one allowed to dispute their authority over coloured peoples. The era of modern imperialism made its appearance, created by the race of Western imperialist monarchies, all of whom rushed at great speed claiming lands for colonisation. Within a matter of no more than fifteen years the imperialist monarchies of Europe were able to snatch at land in Africa and Asia, in all cases without the permission of the inhabitants of those countries. Of the various lands they captured, some of them they turned into colonies proper, whereas others they regarded as semi-colonies or countries falling within their sphere of influence.[1] All these savage attacks were made in the name of 'civilisation' and with the excuse of 'spreading Western civilisation'. Are there any among the white people who do not feel how arrogant they were in their heart when they thought that they were showing their su-

premacy in the speed with which they carried out the job of 'pacification'? The arrogance of the whites and their belief in the eternity of their power over the coloured people found its real basis in the fact that the countries and peoples of the Far East were far behind the West in the fields of science and technology, whilst the coloured peoples of that time were still in a state of deep sleep.

But the booming of the cannons in Port Arthur opened up the eyes of young Asians and planted in their hearts a belief in a coming age. In the battlefields of Manchuria the giant Russian army was beaten and destroyed by Japan, which was so small a country. The peace negotiations in Portsmouth in 1905 confirmed these views, by the acceptance of Japan as an important monarchy. This was regarded by the people of the East not only as the acknowledgement of the victory of the Japanese over Russia, but primarily as the victory of Asia over Europe. All over the world, the light of national awakening began to dawn among the oppressed and insulted nations.

The first place where we heard the echo of the spirit of the Japanese victory was in India. Within the circle of Indian nationalist movements, which up to then were known as loyal movements to the British crown, there emerged in 1907 a group of people led by the radical Ganghadar Tilak, who openly fought for a Free India.

Another place where one can see the influence of the victory of the Japanese over the spirit of foreign countries is in the revolution of the Young Turks in 1908 which was capable of overthrowing the power of the Sultan Abdul Hamid, who was a tyrant. But in actual fact the form taken by the movement of the Young Turks was far more than is revealed by this plain fact. The driving power of the movement was none other than the ideals of the Turks who wished to reach the same level as other nations in Europe, so that the Turks could properly negotiate with other nations who were basing their peace treaty solely on capitulation,[2] which was felt as an insult. The hope in the hearts of the Turks that they would be able to achieve these ideals was greatly strengthened by the example set by Japan.

Consequently Indonesia did not remain silent in view of what was happening in the Eastern hemisphere. As if surprised by the bright light of the victory of Japan, there was born in the premises of the Stovia Medical School in Djakarta an organisation known as *Boedi Oetomo*. This happened in the year 1908. Since that time the young people of Indonesia have maintained their conviction that in time

to come Indonesia will follow the example set by the Japanese. With regard to the birth of Boedi Oetomo, a colonial 'ethicalist', Mr. Van Deventer wrote in a periodical called *De Gids*: 'The miracle has happened. The Indies, the sleeping beauty, has woken'.

This was the first step forward made by the Indonesian nationalist movement under the influence of the events in the Far East.

Further evidence of the influence of the Japanese victory can be seen in the Chinese revolution in the year 1911, led by the late Sun Yat Sen who was able to overthrow the dynastic power of the Manchu Dynasty and replace it by the Republic of China. In this case it was not only the victory of the Japanese which exerted its influence, but also the influence of the revolution of the Young Turks. Just as was the case with the Turks who had just awakened, the Young Chinese too were striving to attain equal rights with other Western states.

This great event in the Chinese mainland gave rise to a spirit of nationalism in the Indonesian Chinese in Indonesia. Their realisation of their national identity and self-respect can be seen from their everyday attitudes. This situation in trun moved the hearts of the Indonesian people and helped to speed up the emergence of the first people's movement which was organised, namely the *Sarikat Islam.*

This has told you something of the relationship between the histories of the rise of the individual nations of Asia. It will now be obvious to everyone that if an event takes place in one part of the world this can cause events to take place elsewhere so that each event can be regarded as a cog in the great machinery of political and social movements.

Even though at that time (1912) political associations were still forbidden by the Constitution, Sarikat Islam was nevertheless able to make rapid progress and to spread its wings over the whole of Indonesia. Hundreds and thousands of people from all walks of life came to stand under its banner. It was almost as though this association was a public hostel, where all kinds of people could gather together to put forward their complaints and lay bare their souls. If there was one chapter of the Indonesian Constitution which could be said to be no longer having any effect because it was ignored by the people, that was Article III of the Government Regulations. Consequently it was necessary for the government to withdraw the Article. It is truly amazing when we recollect that the official withdrawal took place in 1919, after it was announced

in the *Javasche Courant.* Is it not strange and sad in regard to colonial politics when we find that in the time of the Indonesian nationalist movement with its congresses and public meetings, at one time there was a prohibition order against meetings, gatherings and political associations still printed in the Constitution? This story proved once and for all that the government was incapable of doing anything if the people really showed their strong will to the contrary. This proves what was stated with such deep conviction by Professor Krabbe: 'The spiritual power which is active in the legal conscience of the people cannot be deprived of its force by a human word. It digs deep, where it cannot be destroyed, and the wish of the legislator, whether illuminated on parchment or engraved on stone tablets, as time has proved, becomes nothing but an empty sound if it does not find an echo in the soul of man.'

Surprised and frightened by the sight of the people's movement making such rapid progress, Mr. Idenburg, who was Governor General at the time, did not wish to acknowledge Sarikat Islam as a movement and consequently he did not wish to legalise it as a corporate body. Later on he explained that he was prepared to recognise every branch of Sarikat Islam as a corporate body. This meant that Sarikat Islam had to be divided up into a large number of small associations, each of which would stand independently and not be related to the others.

It was thought at the time that it was necessary to move circumspectly and, putting forward the excuse 'it is better to play along for a while than to protest and get into difficulties', the Secretary of Sarikat Islam obeyed the rule put forward by the government. Consequently Sarikat Islam was divided into a number of small associations; each of them had its own world, which was as big or as small as its surroundings, whether it was a village or a town, and none of these associations were related to the others. Each association had its own set of rules and regulations and was an individual corporate body.

But this trick played by small fry like Governor General Idenburg did not produce any effect whatsoever; still less did it bring about the crumbling of the organisation which he had intended. The reason was that a movement which is founded in the spirit of unity, and more important still is based on the principles of religion – Islam – could not be divided up. The various bodies could be separated, but the spirit was one and the same. It was not long before a Central Sarikat Islam was founded, which came to be

regarded as the parent of every small child of Sarikat Islam, spread throughout the entire country. Every year it held its annual congress which was attended by representatives from the independent Sarikat Islam bodies. At this congress common decisions were made which were to serve as a working guide for all. In this way each association of Sarikat Islam, though independent, regarded itself as being a mere branch of one large tree: the Central Sarikat Islam, a body which also received its status as a corporate body in the year 1916. The same was the feeling held at the Central Sarikat Islam. It regarded itself as the parent body. And in practice, that is what it was.

Nevertheless, the trick played by Governor General Idenburg did have one effect. Because of what he had done, the organisation of Sarikat Islam remained weak. This was a position which could easily have led to danger. In point of fact the parent body had no real control over the branches. And if one of the branches did not perform properly, it was not an easy matter for the Central Sarikat Islam to give a tug at the reins because it had no right to interfere. For did not each of the branches stand alone as an independent organisation? There is no need for me here to explain how unsound such an organization structure was and how it could so easily become the target of provocation, especially in a heated political climate.

At the very beginning of the history of the movement, the attitude of the Central Sarikat Islam was very obedient to the government. According to the principles and policies followed at that time,[3] the movement of Central Sarikat Islam was aimed at achieving good will for the nations of Netherlands Indies so that in the end they could achieve self-government. It was not yet fully aware of its own nationality and it still made compromises with the words 'Netherlands Indies'. According to the principles of Sarikat Islam, they wanted the Indonesian nation – at that time they still called it the Netherlands Indies – to interfere in government matters and, acting through the Colonial Council, hoped that in the long run this would become a genuine parliament.

When the National Council was established in 1917 – a Council which was asked for time and time again by Sarikat Islam when it first started the movement – it stated in the programme of Sarikat Islam that the political objectives were gradually working their way into the authority of the National Council, so that in the end it would probably become a real parliament whose members were elected by the people. In the programme it also stated: 'To establish

village Councils and a Regency Council at the provincial level in Java and similar Councils for parts outside Java.

But in the first National Council, the representatives of the Central Sarikat Islam, the Hon. Tjokroaminoto and Abdul Moeis never said a single discordant word as a symbol of the fact that they had been upset by government policy. Then later on the association changed its attitude, which was evident not only in the change in its objectives but also from the policy of the movement. In the second National Council, when Sarikat Islam was represented by Hadji Agoes Salim it was possible to see the sharper and stronger opposition which occurred and which was in keeping with the spirit of the times as a result of the evolution of the colonial dispute. When it became evident to Sarikat Islam that the work of six years in the National Council had borne no fruit, it then took a definite decision in the year 1923 to drop its policy of cooperation with the government or the policy of the National Council and instead adopted a policy of non-cooperation.

Sarikat Islam is an organisation for which there has never been any equal in the history of the Indonesian nationalist movement. It is an organisation which has had experience at all levels of political change in the Colony, that is to say ranging from being an instrument to help the colonial government up to the time when it became a force which was responsible for the main opposition.

There have also been changes in structure and in name, according to the requirements of the times. The existence of a corporate body as a sign of goodwill was no longer esteemed to be of any value. In the year 1923 the Central Sarikat Islam altered its name to the Partai Sarikat Islam. Not long after this, a scheme of party discipline was drawn up, consisting of strict rules and regulations. The loose relationship existing between the many bodies of Sarikat Islam and the Central Sarikat Islam was done away with and replaced by an organisation so that now there was only one body which owned its own branches and had the secretariat at the top. After this there was added to the end of the name Partai Sarikat Islam the word 'Indonesia'. By this means the party wished to identify its nationality.

Even though I had not wished to talk about the political parties individually, I have been compelled to explain in great detail the background story of the movement of Sarikat Islam. This is not merely because this happens to be the oldest party in the country, but because the change in its policies from time to time have proved

to be a mirror which reflects so clearly to us the image of the development of the relationship between the Colony and the colonial opposition.

I felt it was necessary to state all this at an early stage so as to be able to give you a clear idea of the development of the independence ideal in Indonesia.

In the past, from the year 1912 to 1919, Sarikat Islam gave its own stamp to the Indonesian nationalist movement and consequently the attitude taken by that movement at that time provides us with evidence of the characteristics of the national movement of that time. Basically, the aim of the movement at that time was to work to assist the government and to provide leadership so that gradually self-government could be achieved, an idea which was always put forward at that time as the final objective.

Indonesia changed her attitude only after she was influenced by world events which followed the Great War. The antithesis in colonial matters then became much sharper; the same may be said of the clashes between the various races, the disputes between this country and that country. Likewise the morale of the Netherlands was such that they did not know how to handle the machinery of politics in accordance with the requirements of the day and age, and this contributed to those causes which led to bitter clashes of view.

The psychology of the Indonesian nationalist movement during its first decade could be summed up as follows:

'In the very beginning one heard a very small voice, which was soft and timid and which said that it trusted the discretion of the government. People hoped to receive support and acquire leadership from those in power in their aim of finally gaining the ideal which had only recently entered their hearts. They felt that the shining future was going to be pursued jointly by them and the government. As evidence of this policy, I would remind you here of the words of the leaders of Sarikat Islam at their first Congresses. Besides believing in the wisdom of the government, it could also be that they possessed a feeling of inherent weakness which was the basic cause of the course of policy they were following, a course which pleaded with the government to give them assistance and leadership. This weakness was felt because of years of a feeling of inferiority, an illusion that white people possessed qualities which are noble and perfect. But these times passed and when they had finally called the bluff of the oppressor and when they had seen how the government consistently broke its promises, their feeling

was swamped by a feeling of mistrust. In the beginning the suspicions were only slight and still blurred, as though they did not have things in the proper focus. People were still not yet fully convinced that the Netherlands could cheat and people still believed that it was only the government itself which was to blame. People still held high hopes for something to come from the parliament in the Netherlands, hopes that this parliament would come and defend Indonesia and meet her right and proper requests, if only the heart-rending sighs and sobs of the Indonesian people could be heard by them there. But this only led to more regrets and more moans. It was in their ignorance that people had been hoping for what was impossible'.[4]

The full awareness came for the first time when the government broke the November promise (1918), which had been made with all due ceremony in the National Council. Frightened by what they had seen happen in Europe and which could easily extend to Indonesia, the government of the Netherlands Indies stated in the year 1918:

'The new directive which has been taken in the Netherlands as a result of world events, will find its expression in deciding the scope of the aim of government there'.

And on the 2nd December 1918, a government representative added: 'What is meant by the government in the statement it has just made? I would say that in the light of recent events in the world and their influence which can be seen in every field of politics it is felt that it is essential to make serious changes in government regulations, which will all be based on new fundamental principles, or – if the changes have already begun – the execution will follow quickly so that what previously was supposed to be fairly distant has now almost certainly become a reality. No one standing in the midst of the storm of life can avoid being carried by the streams of the world; likewise it was not possible for the government to stand against it, even if it had so wished. The government accepts all these pleas which have come from prominent parties in this Colony which go hand in hand with the course being followed in the Netherlands'.

But soon after the November troubles were over, the Netherlands forgot the promise they had made. All talk like 'It is essential to make certain grave changes . . . and to carry out with extreme speed . . .' no longer held good. Who can be surprised any more if this sort of thing destroys the trust which the Indonesian people had in the Netherlands?

In the meantime the revolution in the land of the Russians, who had overthrown the power of the Tsar and which was also followed by social changes throughout Europe, changes which swept away several thrones, all contributed to stirring up the political atmosphere in Indonesia.

Because of all these influences, there appeared in Sarikat Islam movement an extreme Left-wing which was a hidden Communist wing and which later on became a party on its own after being expelled from Sarikat Islam, when it became the Indonesian Communist Party. Up to the rebellion in 1926, the influence of the Indonesian Communist Party and of Sarikat Rakjat, which became an offshoot of the Indonesian Communist Party, was very great on the people's movement in the country.

There was also another source of influence. Like what had happened before, it was also possible at that time to see the influence which came from the new independence movements in the countries of the Asian continent, in our case the Indonesian Nationalist Movement. What really stirred the hearts of the inhabitants of Indonesia, was the independence movement in Turkey which was led by Mustafa Kemal Pasha which was based both on force and on skill. The guns of Afiun Karahissar which destroyed the Greek attack in Anatolia under the supervision of the British, sounded in the ears of young Asians like a new sermon reminding them that it was high time for them to rise and arrange their own self-determination. The Asians regained their self-confidence. Previously it had been the Japanese who were always quoted as examples and symbols of Asian independence. Now the people who carried the lucky star were the Turks who had gained a new youth and were capable of opposing the crimes of western imperialism. In the firmament above the city of Ankara there appeared a star of hope with its bright light illuminating the whole of Asia. In the hearts of every Asian Ankara became regarded as a Mecca of the new nationalism which teaches as its basic principle a belief in one's own capability.

Was it possible for the whirlwind of politics which was blowing so wildly over the whole of Asia[5] to pass over the atmosphere of Indonesia without in any way upsetting the political climate there? In addition to the political movement of Islam and the existing Communist movement, there arose a new stream of politics, namely radical nationalism, which started near the premises of the Boedi Oetomo, in the Indonesian association in the Netherlands and also

outside the party structure. It was some several years later, after the influence of the Communist rebellions in 1926 and 1927, that a way was found to form the nationalist movement. Even though it was still very young it was possible within a short time for the Indonesian Nationalist Party to attract the attention oft he people. The name became famous in every nook and cranny of the villages. Its banners flew all over the place and were regarded by the people as the sign of the arrival of free Indonesia. Until its recent dissolution, the Indonesian Nationalist Party stood in the forefront of the Indonesian independence movement. This is how the objectives of the policital parties in Indonesia changed. Now the independence movement clearly and definitely declared that it was fighting for a Free Indonesia, which also meant: 'Indonesia freed from the Netherlands'.

There no longer existed any honest party which could doubt the true objectives of the association.

Nevertheless the objectives were only put forward properly after the end of the great war, as a result of the influence of world events. The voices which spoke about it for the first time had been heard earlier in the Indonesian independence movement. The group which first spread the ideal of Indonesian independence was the *Indische Partij* which was lead by Douwes Dekker, Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo, and Soewardi Soerjaningrat. It is true, of course, that the voice of freedom was not so loud as it is at present.

The first slogan which was used was 'Hindia free from the Netherlands'. At these meetings where the Indonesian people claimed their liberty, the word 'Indonesia' was still unknown with any political sense. The party itself was heading towards the freedom of land called Hindia which was also owned by the Indo-Dutch according to the view of I.P., because their mothers were born there.

The main plank in the platform of the I.P., which at that time had changed its name to *Partij Insulinde* was said to be that of educating an Indian nationalism by strengthening the ideals of the unity of the nation. For this reason the I.P. wanted every member to call himself an 'Indian'.

In the illustration mentioned above, the seeds of the unity of the nation were distinctly so. Whereas Sarikat Islam had put forward religion as the bond of unity for the Partij Insulinde, the bond which these people wanted to strengthen was the nationalistic feeling.

The Partij Insulinde, which later on changed its name to the

National Indian Party, was not able to exert any influence on the people. Nevertheless, the seed of nationalism which it spread together with the ideal of the freedom of the nation was planted in the hearts of thousands of people. This was specially true in the case of young Indonesians who were extremely taken by this idea. As it happened later on, the world events which we sketched out earlier on turned out to be a suitable environment in which the existing seeds could then grow.

The ideal of *Indonesia Merdeka* took the same general course of development as any other new idea which first comes to the mind of a small group of people and then extends to cover the multitude. A certain lively group pushed forward the idea and it spread into the hearts of the people. The Indonesian press also played its part in helping the serious development of the ideals, whilst the press of 'the other side', which was continuously insulting the Indonesian nation, also took part in stirring the hearts of men. And it came to pass that wherever there was a group of people talking, they talked of nothing but 'Free Indonesia'. The ideals of independence had become the main topic of people's conversation. But the particular way in which this ideal was expressed varied according to the person himself and his particular occupation.

Every nationalist party in Indonesia now declared without any doubt that they were aiming at 'Free Indonesia'. Regarding the attitude of the P.P.P.K.I. it was stated earlier by Hadji Agoes Salim in the periodical *De Socialist* which I quote verbatim:

'It is clear – he said – 'that the P.P.P.K.I. is a body comprising all the Indonesian independence movements, regardless of the great differences between the parties of which it is composed in regard to the method to be employed in achieving the aim. At that time it was accepted by all the members of the P.P.P.K.I. that the objective was: Indonesia free from the Netherlands, with early recognition and without any strings attached'.[6]

With regard to the time element and to the question as to when Indonesia would gain freedom, he wrote: 'If we were to insist at this stage on the means we are to employ, there would be no parties in the P.P.P.K.I. The desire of all of us is "to be free soon". It is only the question of how to achieve this which gives rise to differing opinions'.

It was only natural that there should be certain groups of people who would not wish to declare openly their desire for a 'Free Indonesia' even though this was the ideal which was locked in their

hearts. These were people who thought that it would be better first of all to ask for a dominion status as their final aim. But attitudes of this kind displayed more cowardice rather than skill. Was it possible for the people from outside, especially the Dutch, to be bluffed regarding the aim? Every man has acknowledged the fundamental truth that it is the right of every nation to be free, and for this reason the form of the association could not be concealed any longer.

Even though the Dutch had declared that they respected the ideal of independence, they so often put forward problems and obstacles as excuses with a view to maintaining the right of the Netherlands to keep on administering Indonesia for ever.

In the hymns which are sung by the Christian community we can often hear statements of the nature of axioms stating that it was by the will of God that the Netherlands governed Indonesia. The suggestion is that the 'right' of colonising the country and staying on our land for ever is punishment from God. But even to people who are prepared to acknowledge that everything on earth came into being as a result of the will of God, there still arises the question: Will the will of God remain unchanged for ever? Pretexts of this kind have no meaning whatsoever.

There are also some people who have claimed that the Netherlands had to possess Indonesia in accordance with the statements in the book of Genesis. The two countries were linked in accordance with the prophecy, – so it was said – and consequently this link could never be broken. This opinion was also defended by the juridical theory which was based on 'what has become history'. But the people who put forward this theory often forgot that eternal historical truths did not include the relationship between nations, because a revolution can very easily break up what was previously thought to be eternal.

The theory of historical destiny, just like the theory which said it was due to the will of God, has no basis whatsoever. The French Revolution of 1789 which suddenly caused the fall the State and the feudal system and disregarded the way of life of society at that time is an event in history where a sudden change was wrought in what had become the customs of the people for centuries. Then in 1848 the liberal revolution swept away every remnant of the aristocratic rule and the rule of rank and privilege which still was in existence at the time, thus opening up the way for the advent of democracy as we know it today. The history of the nineteenth and

twentieth centuries is stained with blood, showing that when it is a question of national aspirations the bases of international law are insufficient. The kings and emperors belonging to the families of Hohenzollern, Habsburg and Romanov continuously claimed that they sat on the thrones of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia by the Grace of God and that their right to rule the countries in question was a case of historical destiny. Could they have imagined at the time that their rights, which seemed so eternal and so much part of the destiny of their peoples, could suddenly be no more? There have been many examples in our times which have shown us that everything which has been regarded as founded in history and eternal is only mortal.[7] This is bound to be the case with the process of history when it comes to the question of colonies. The colonial system could not withstand for all time the stream of social developments which in the long run was bound to destroy colonial relationships.

It was an awareness of this fact which imbued young Indonesians with the confidence that the freedom of their country would come in the end. In the long run they knew that every nation which was oppressed or colonised would regain its freedom. This, they knew, was an iron law of world history. The only point at issue was due to the fact that the way independence would be regained was entirely dependent on the nature of the colonising country which had the power in its hands. It was primarily up to them whether independence would come about by calm and peaceful means.[8]

When the country finally became independent in the future, every heart and voice would be singing about it, so that it was necessary to give this country some form and features. First and foremost, it was essential that the country should have a name of its own. 'Netherlands Indies' could never remain the name of the country because it was a name which signified dependence on another. In the same way, it was impossible to use the name 'Hindia' as it was, as was first suggested by the Indonesian National Party, because this name would give rise to confusion with the neighbouring country known as India. Consequently the people all agreed that the country should be called 'Indonesia', a word which was used in the middle of the last century by great ethnologists like Rogan, Bastian etc. to serve as a name for the islands which stretched away in the Indian Ocean. It was in this way that the name 'Indonesia' began to be used by the Indonesian Association. Since then it has been accepted by all the national movements. This

is especially true of the Young People's Movements who loved chanting the name. The Indonesian National Party which had created the ideal of freedom for our country, could now embrace this name.

Once having reached agreement in deciding upon a name, another problem arose regarding the form that Indonesia would take in times to come. Owing to its geographical position and the similarity of aims of the people it was decided that the country should be a united country, should be one country. It is true that the infrastructure itself could be a single-state country or else a united states. All this could be arranged later on the basis of practical considerations, but so far as the outside world is concerned it would be one unit. One nation. The ideal of national unity, which was first put forward by the Indonesian National Party, has now become the political spirit of Indonesia. In this way the ideal of Indonesian unity achieved a clear and definite form. It was to be One Indonesia, and indivisible whole.

All the national movements of the country have now adopted the symbol of unity. Propaganda for the union has taken the form of educating the public into becoming the people of Indonesia. In the people of every island in Indonesia there was inculcated the basic idea that they would become part of one nation, the Indonesian Nation. As a continuation of this idea, propaganda was commenced in support of the Indonesian language, the Malay language being chosen as the language of unity because it is easy to learn and easy to develop.

This is how the situation arose. In a short space of time an idea which was born in one of the smallest groups had become the guiding light of the whole people.

But now came the attack from the Dutch who protested against the word 'Indonesia' and the term 'Indonesian unity'. There were also people who fought against the name because it had been used on the banners of the 'Free from the Netherlands' movement. Very often there were people who scandalously alleged that the name was a Communist term, as though it was the Communists who had made the name. There is no need for me here to explain the reasoning behind this.

It can be protested here that the attack on the name had some basic reason in it. It was not only the oldfashioned or reactionary Dutch who criticised the name, but also those who were in favour of the Indonesian movement, such as the Leyden School which was

so much hated by the Dutch themselves. And I will also mention here the opinions of Prof. van Vollenhoven, mainly because he was well known as a defender of the rights of the Indonesians and he had been using the term *Indonesiër* in his books. On page 383 of the review *Koloniaal Tijdschrift* of the year 1929 he wrote as follows:

'In view of the fact that whilst the Netherlands Indies houses by far the great majortity of the Indonesians, but not all of them – 49 million out of 66 million – it is not practical to use the term Indonesia as a political name for the country which is now owned by the Netherlands in South-East Asia'.

Frankly I must say that the reason put forward by Prof. van Vollenhoven is not one I can accept. In order to deny the use of the term Indonesia as a political concept he compared the term on the basis of geographical and ethnological facts. All throughout the world there are examples which show that political names are not suitable if one considers them solely within the meaning of geography and ethnology. The land of the dollar was officially named the United States of America, whereas geographically speaking the area which was called America referred to the entire continent stretching from the North Pole to the South and dividing the Atlantic Ocean from the Pacific Ocean. This mass of land also contains countries which are not included in the United States. Even though on the basis of geographical meanings and common sense the United States of America is not the right name, it is still used as the political name because other countries in the same continent have their own names.

The same situation may be said to apply to the Germans. Outside the land of Germany, known as Deutschland, there are also the territories of neighbouring countries where there live more or less 10 million Germans, whilst another six million of them have their own state which goes under the name of Austria. Now there will be no people anywhere who will dare to deny the right of the Germans in the 'Reich' to name their own country Deutschland. There have never been any people who have claimed that Deutschland could not be used as a political name of a country because it does not coincide with the ethnological boundaries because, to use the words of Prof. van Vollenhoven, all the Germans did not live there but only 65 million out of 75 million.

This will show how illogical the argument put forward by Prof. van Vollenhoven is!

In the light of the examples I have mentioned, it can quite definitely be claimed that the word Indonesia can easily be used as a political name for the region which was previously known officially as Netherlands India. It is just a matter of usage. If the name Indonesia were used commonly it would become very suitable for world use. The objection put forward by Prof. van Vollenhoven could well be a strong one if the name Indonesia could give rise to confusion in the international scene, that is to say if there were another country which used the same name. There is no such country in existence. Other countries which are also inhabited by the Indonesian peoples possess their own name, such as the Philippines, Madagascar, Malacca and the Malay States etc.

There is no valid reason whatsoever in law why the name Indonesia could not be used as a replacement of the name Hindia Belanda or Netherlands Indies. Yet on the other hand the name Indonesia can be defended on the basis of international jurisprudence. Since the Fundamental Law of the Netherlands in 1922 it has been said that the term 'colonies and occupied territories' had been abolished and was to be replaced by legal subjects who were independent, whose name would incorporate their own name as a part of the Netherlands. In the light of the spirit of the Fundamental Law of the Netherlands it was no longer possible to defend the name Netherlands Indies, because this was a name which originally came from a time when colonies were officially regarded as a possession in law. Was not this a mere question of playing tricks with the fundamental law if Indonesia was not to be allowed to use its name, whilst the colony in the West Indies had long since been using the name Surinam and Curaçao?

There is also another feature which is important and cannot be ignored for ever. This is the public feeling in Indonesia and the group of people who are aware of the fact that they represent the millions who not only do like the name but also are making immediate use of it.

This fact also influenced Mr. J. J Schriecke, so that he dared to write as advice in his book *De Indische Politiek* that is was necessary for the government to accept the name Indonesia as the official name of the country. I will quote his views verbatim here, so that his opinions can be clearly followed:

'It may easily happen later on that questions will arise as to whether the effort made to avoid a clash of nationality in the rule of law was not a waste of time and whether the new measures aim-

ed at dealing with the differences between the Dutch and the natives and the children of foreign origin who are not Dutch were merely a piece of "camouflage".

The question which then arose may be answered frankly by "No". This is very similar to the way in which the term "fellow-sinner" is used in the mouths of priests whilst the word *homo sapiens* is used by sociologists. Both these terms are used to signify one and the same thing, but each phrase imparts different overtones to it.

The answer to the first question depends upon the strength of national feelings in Asia. It is essential that the strength of feeling should not be ignored.

But a job is not finished by merely stating what the differences are. The children of natives and foreigners who are not Dutch are now marked with a negative sign. They need to have their own name, just as those coming from the Netherlands are called Netherlanders. They were not Dutch and they will not become Dutch and consequently there is no reason that they should be given the name. But in the meantime they do not wish to throw away their name of origin, for example Djawa, Sunda, Minangkabau etc. But the intellectuals among them would also wish for a national name as their name in the international scene. The term Netherlands subject by the side of Netherlanders was only suitable for the older times.

The name which could be given to them even though it is not right scientifically would be none other than Indonesians. And this is another step which is important for us to continue during the gradual change from Netherlands Indies to Indonesia.

Why were they afraid of that name? It is true that it would be difficult for the Dutch to make this change. But anyone who considers the situation seriously will easily find that some sort of sacrifice in this respect has to be made. If the Netherlands Indies were to become free and stand independently beside other countries, it is certain that they would want names of their own. What are the reasons why they should not be allowed even at this stage to use their own names whilst still falling within the scope of the Netherlands monarchy? Surely the aim should have been to give them a feeling of trust that they would be happier if they were inside the Monarchy than outside it. The use of the name Indonesia would have helped to bring about this feeling'.[9]

By means of a long quotation from the book by Mr. Schriecke I intend to show that I agree entirely with the reasons which have been put forward in defence of the name Indonesia. Is this pos-

sible, when I myself am struggling for a free Indonesia, whilst Mr. Schriecke is anxious to achieve an Indonesia which would fall within the ambit of the Netherlands monarchy? My reason for including this quotation is to show that the group of higher civil servants in government positions question the name of Indonesia and whether it could be used as a political name of a country.

And now I must insert a word regarding the attacks which have been made on the ideal of unity for Indonesia. It has often been said that Indonesian unity was really a figment of the imagination, because the islands of Indonesia are inhabited by a number of different races of people which have no relationships between them except that they happen all of them to be under the authority of the Netherlands.[10]

Reasons of this kind have long been considered wrong by the experts in international relationships, for example by a number of professors at Leyden. In their booklet called *De aanslag op Leiden* they wrote as follows in protest: 'Without daring to predict what the future will be for the Netherlands Indies, we would like to contradict on the basis of cogent reasons the stories which are put about to the effect that the inhabitants of Hindia consist of "a number of different races", which have no relationships of any kind between them except for the fact that the countries they happen to inhabit belong to the Dutch crown . . . and on the other hand we can definitely state that on the basis of the facts as presented the majority of the population consists of a single race, the Indonesian race, and these inhabitants have been related with one another since very ancient times right up to the present, and this relationship has been maintained strongly throughout'.[11]

And it was not just anybody, but none other than the late Dr. A. Kuyper (the leader of the Anti-Revolutionary Party as it used to be named) who stated in his book *Ons Program* that 'the laws of nature and of destiny unite the populations of the islands of Nusa Hindia and weld them into a single nation. It was not the Dutch Government which came as the founder of a unity which had never existed before, but their task was limited to reorganising a union which already existed'.[12]

The question of the various languages which exist in Indonesia at the present time, the question of the differences in moral habits, character and customs, these are problems which cannot hinder the formation of the Indonesian nation.

The history which tells of the formation of countries and em-

pires provides sufficient evidence of the fact that the existence of a national organisation does not depend upon a unity of origin, unity of language, unity of religion or any other type of unity. If it were a question of race or language which was necessary in order to make it possible for a nation to emerge or be founded, then Switzerland must appear to us as a spiritual miracle because the inhabitants of this country originated from three different nations and even to this day their languages are still three in number. More amazing still is the example given by the United States of America. The people of this country originated from a large number of different races, all of them having their different languages and religions and customs,[13] but nonetheless the American nation was born and not only possesses one language but also has its own national culture. The progress of technology and the development of means of transport[14] are factors which eliminate the great differences among sections of the population.

I will now be quite frank and say that the differences between one region and another existing in Indonesia, whose populations primarily till the soil, cannot be swept away so rapidly and mechanically as was the case in America. But these differences are not such as to constitute obstacles to the existence and formation of national unity. It may well be that in the long run it will be acknowledged by everyone that the true origin of a nation is the *will* to unite. 'Nationalism' said Lothrop Stoddard, 'is a belief held by a fairly large number of individuals to the effect that they constitute a "nationality"; it is a sense of belonging together as a "Nation".'[15]

This was also the opinion of Prof. Kranenburg, who said that the criterion of being a nation is 'awareness as a union organised as one, an awareness which comes from a belief in having a similar destiny and fate. It is an awareness which becomes stronger when the members are subjected to similar fortunes; when they suffer together in a disaster, when they rejoice together in what they have attained by mutual effort, in short because of the recollection in their hearts of a common historical background'.[16]

In the hearts of the Indonesian people there is an awareness that they are meant for unity and for living together and this confidence seems to be stronger the younger the persons concerned. After all, the old will soon die and young ones will take their place and this will mean that the spirit of unity will be even greater. Is it then only the young Indonesians who are known to be the champions of national unity? No, there is also the memory of the Modjo-

pahit Kingdom which did not just belong to Netherlands Indies. It also formed part of Malacca and the Philippines. This serves to strengthen the general feeling of unity. The fact that Indonesia has been living for so long under the flag of the Netherlands only strengthens the relationships with its own people. For it was the decree of fate that the authority of the Dutch would be based on unification and their efforts would bring about Indonesian unity. The realisation that free Indonesia can only be attained by maintaining a united front contributes further to our confidence in the basic feeling of unity which we possess.

It is true to say that the spirit of unity is not just as strong everywhere. In some places it is stronger, in some places it is weaker. It is less strong in the case of peasants in the remoter villages and among the very poor, whose views are no wider than the limits of the soil they till, who do not think of anything other than their own misfortune and their pre-occupation with what lies in store for them on the following day and how they are to pay the taxes which constitute such a heavy burden upon them. On the other hand, the feeling of solidarity is extremely strong when one looks at the young people who went to school, the educated people and people who already show political consciousness. But these are the groups which constitute the centre of all action. There used to be rumours which said that because the group was only a small group means that it does not represent the true thought of the people and does not express the will of the General Public. But 'All corporate action' says Prof. Toynbee 'is started by individuals and carried on mainly by an active minority, whilst the masses follow behind'.[17] This may be said of the objectives of Indonesian independence, which can be set out in a very short phrase: Indonesia, free and indivisible! So far as this problem is concerned there is no reason for dispute between the opinions of the nationalist parties. What sort of form is free Indonesia to take in the future. Is it to be a republic, a united states, just as in the western countries, or is it to be a decentralised union in accordance with the trend of the East? These are questions which have not yet been discussed in detail, although it can already be said that the leaders have got to grips with the problem. Later on the questions will solve themselves as a result of the social events of the future. The particular conditions which obtain at that time will determine the outward appearance of Free Indonesia.

These differences of opinion appear at a time when we should ask

the question: Which policy should we use in order to achieve our common goal? Here we can see that we are standing at the cross-roads. As I stated at the beginning of my speech, there are two kinds of political weapons and there is a very big difference between them: the policy of cooperation and the policy of non-cooperation.

Let us look at each of these policies one at a time.

2. THE POLICY OF COOPERATION

I am first of all going to explain the policy of cooperation, which constitutes the harder part of my task. I had to explain what good it would do if the people here were to adopt the principle of this policy and spread it in this country. The main difficulty for me is whether a person like myself, who believes sincerely in the policy of non-cooperation, can explain accurately the thoughts of the cooperators who are sometimes known as 'moderates' as opposed to to the 'radicals'. But now that I have accepted the challenge, I must try to analyse the question very carefully so that I can give a correct picture of it. I would therefore ask my audience to bear with me if I make any errors in doing this.

The second difficulty for me is that there are very few views which are available regarding this cooperation principle. It may even be regarded as something which has to be like this, so that people think it is not necessary to bother to give any detailed thought to the subject. Perhaps it is worth my while saying that the cooperators themselves have not made any effort to explain their own basic principles.

The explanations which they usually give amount to nothing more than the fact that the National Council is a valuable place for attacking one's opponents and for exerting an influence on the government as well as a place for consultation and opposition.

Very often the policy of cooperation is referred to as the politics of realism. I am not going to discuss here the rights and wrongs of this assumption. The basic foundation of the policy of cooperation is that Indonesia is now under the control of the Dutch and therefore independence can only be attained as a result of the help of the colonising power, even though this help will not come until the very end. On the whole this policy is based on trust, on trust that in the long run the Netherlands will give freedom to Indonesia in the

form of dominion status. At one stage this conviction was expressed in a parable which made it quite easy to understand. If I cannot get a lift from the Hague to Paris but there is a car which will get me to Brussels, then I accept this. When I get to Brussels I will say 'Thank you' to the motorist and then leave the car.

The impression this story is trying to convey is that the colonised power can work side by side with the colonising power until dominion status is reached. And when this level has at last been reached, according to this assumption, the colonised power will have every means to obtain the key to open the last door to freedom, even though at this stage the colonising power may wish to prevent him. Once the status of dominion has been reached, the colonised power will find that it has sufficient strength to achieve its final object, whether this is done voluntarily or as a result of the use of force.

Even though those who support cooperation were terribly hurt by the breaking of the November promises in 1918 and consequently have reason to distrust the government,[18] they still have a certain amount of confidence left that the people of the Netherlands will accept the colonial problem in its true form and will change their attitude to the problem of Indonesian independence. Furthermore they still cherish the hope that the ideals which have become widespread on an international scale will exert an influence on the Dutch in such a way that the Netherlands will liberate Indonesia in the future. It is for this reason that they often lift their eyes in the direction of the League of Nations which is now regarded as the forum for all movements in the field of internationalism. At the present moment this conviction is even stronger because in Indonesia itself the Dutch appear to have started a new ethical movement which believes that the final end of colonial policy for Indonesia should be Free Indonesia. People expect the support of goodwill who would like to cooperate with them in the struggle to reach their highest national ideals.

Even though the cooperators are far from happy regarding the basic principles and the organisation of the National Council and other councils which exist at the moment, they still think that it will serve a better purpose to work inside this framework. By using their own voices in these councils, they hope that in the long run they will have a greater influence on the ruling of the country. If the influence is to become any greater, it will be necessary for the franchise to be extended so that the Indonesians will have the

majority influence in the National Council. Furthermore, the powers of the Council itself will have to be enlarged gradually until the Council becomes a true Parliament. It is in this way that these people hope gradually to be able to eliminate the influence of the Dutch in the government of our country.

To show more clearly the form of the cooperation policy, I will now quote in detail the explanation of the principles of the Party as recently founded by Tabrani under the name of *Partai Rakjat Indonesia* (Indonesian People's Party). This is a party which follows the policy of cooperation. The basic principle reads as follows: 'The party is convinced that the formation of a sound government can only be achieved by adapting the policies to the demands of today, whilst at the same time bearing in mind what has occurred in the past and thinking of the developments which are desired in the future.

Taking present conditions into consideration as the starting point, the Party will move towards its ideals and at all times its methods will be determined according to the stage of progress which has been reached in approaching the goal.

Within the structure of the state in Indonesia at the present time there is a National Council and also other councils which can be used as places for us to defend basic national principles and ideas and to exert our influence on the government. The fact that these councils may be far from what they ought to be is a further reason for the Party to organise some of its work in accordance with the Party's views. The main objective of the Party it to develop these councils so that they are converted into a true Parliament. In short, the authority of the National Council should be extended until it becomes a genuine Parliament of the country.

Consequently the development must take place stage by stage: starting off from a colony with a National Council which is not a Parliament, it gradually becomes a dominion with self-government which is responsible for the National Council and in the end it becomes a Free Indonesia with a genuine Parliament.

Therefore the Party recognises the political ideal for all nations – and this includes Indonesia as well – is that the stage of independence should be attained by passing through dominion status.

Because of this view, the Party will try first of all to reach the stage of dominion status. This is understood to mean one Indonesia which governs itself and whose government is responsible for a National Council based on democratic principles.

Viewed from the inside, Indonesia will be a country which has self-government, whereas from the outside it will have a position in international relationships which is stronger and more secure'.[19]

Furthermore, it is the intention of the cooperators to try to Indonesianise every branch of government, the army and the police as a path by which to reach national independence. Generally speaking, they hope that gradually all the high positions in the government will be transferred to Indonesians. This will mean that every rank and grade of post will be open to Indonesians, unlike what happens in the present situation. And in accordance with the intention that the army should in the end be Indonesianised, there ought to be a native militia.

By occupying all the high positions and replacing the Dutch by Indonesians in the administration of the colony and the army, it is hoped that authority will gradually be assumed and at the same time we will receive practice in self-government.

Once this stage has been reached, then 'independence is not far away'. This is the hypothesis of the Cooperators!

These are, then, the basic principles of Cooperation. They are based on the belief that the Netherlands will be prepared gradually to release Indonesia and that the Dutch who are occupying the high positions in the administration of the colony will voluntarily be prepared to give way and allow themselves to be replaced by Indonesians. Indeed, whether the policy of cooperation is the right one or the wrong one as a means of achieving a Free Indonesia, will depend upon whether this hypothesis is right or wrong.

The fact that the belief of the Cooperators in the 'goodwill' of the colonising power has been severely shaken can be seen in the statements they have made in their press regarding Boedi Oedomo, the Party of the aristocracy and government officials, who say that the Governor General de Graeff claimed in the National Council that the Dutch government in Indonesia still needs to be in existence for a very long time and this does not encourage the members of the Cooperative Party and they rejected the statement with anger. Nevertheless they still regard the National Council as serving the same purpose.

There is also another matter still which encourages the moderates to cooperate with the government – although this may sound rather odd – indeed it gives many of us doubts regarding the ultimate success of their policy; the feeling of their own sense of weakness!

They are really aware that every change which can be achieved

within the framework of the government of the colony can only be achieved by force and this can only happen when there is a strong popular movement behind them which is supporting their aims, because there is no government which can continue permanently to ignore the ideals which spring from the hearts of the people.

In actual fact, the real situation is that the seats of the moderate parties are occupied almost exclusively by government officials. This is the snag. This is the basic cause of their own weakness. Because according to the general interpretation of the regulations of the colony, an official is not supposed to be freely involved in politics. They can only act within the framework allowed to them, which insists that they respect the government they are serving. They are required to retain their loyalty and if they do not their jobs would disappear or else they would find it necessary to leave their jobs themselves.

This weakness is even more serious in view of the fact that the ranks of the Cooperators also include those who have no political principles at all or indeed any understanding of politics. These are the people who only wish to sit in the National Council which is the puppet of the Netherlands government. Therefore we are not surprised when we find that the honest members of the Cooperation Party are not pleased to see 'friends' of this kind sitting alongside them.

This has been the real reason why in actual practice the policy of cooperation, no matter how radical the programme seemed to the outside world, like the programme of Indonesianisation – turned out to be nothing more or less than following the government and patiently accepting the slowness and lateness of the progress of Indonesia, which the Netherlands are determined to maintain as long as they can.

This feeling of self-insuffiency was also a part of the reason why the Moderates were so pleased with the P.P.P.K.I. Through the medium of bodies like this, they were able to communicate with the parties of radical non-cooperation, which had the following of the majority of people, parties which had real characteristics which were showing greater and greater strength. As a result of this relationship they hoped to be able to make use of the power of the radicals in their actions in the National Council. With the backing of this power behind them, they hope that they can force the government to comply with their requests, or at any rate some of them.

In his article in the review *De Socialist* of the 19th October,

1929, H. A. Salim provided a picture of the psychology of the Cooperators. He wrote:
'It is obvious that the moderate parties hope to achieve joy from the movements of their friends, their radical allies, even though they are not brave and will not be responsible for openly supporting the policy of the movement. This shows that the moderate policy gave more signs of weakness than any sign of non-cooperation'.

I hope that in this short analysis I have been able to show you clearly what is the meaning of the Cooperation policy and the psychology of its basic principle.

3. THE POLICY OF NON-COOPERATION

I am now going to deal with the question of non-cooperation, a policy which is not so easy to explain as the policy of cooperation, because in this case there are far more problems involved.

There are people who often say that the policy of non-cooperation is nothing more than a policy of exhibition of feelings and sentiments and is therefore unrealistic or untrue. These people say that this policy will delay the achievement of Free Indonesia because it is a policy which prevents people from sitting in the councils, whereas in actual fact these are the very places where politics are handled.

But this type of opinion is distorted and shows a lack of knowledge of the type that is required to judge the depths of politics. The suspicion often arises because this policy of non-cooperation is usually identified with the movement of Gandhi, which is based on the Hindu religion. Since the Hindu religion which serves as the spiritual basis of non-cooperation in India does not exist in Indonesia, people get the feeling that non-cooperation cannot find its application in Indonesia either.

It is an opinion that finds no basis in the developments of history. People often forget that the policy of non-cooperation was developed by the Irish long before the time of Gandhi. It was by this policy that they were able to compel the British to legislate for Home Rule for Ireland, something which was never achieved by John Redmond, who had always supported the policy of cooperation with the government. For the Irish, non-cooperation was not a religion like it was in the case of Hinduism, but it was a political belief based on the view that independence cannot be achieved by

assisting the oppressor or being considerate towards him, but only actions which prove that one believes in oneself and one's own efforts. The basic principle is not one of legally developing the rights of authority of the oppressor, but the cancellation of these rights.[20] The Irish began to develop this policy of non-cooperation after they had studied the independence movement of the Hungarians during the last century, a movement which was based on refusal and passive resistance under the leadership of Franz Deâk.

Without the use of violence of any kind and merely by the application of a strong will, the Hungarians were able to overcome Austria and free themselves from the domination of Austria.

Anyone who studies these events will not find it difficult to see that non-cooperation in Indonesia possesses a national characteristic of its own and cannot be identified with the course followed by Gandhi. It is true that it made its appearance because of influence from outside, but the attitude and content of the movement are completely suited to present day conditions in Indonesia. If it were not so, it certainly would not attract the people as strongly as it does. What was written in *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 4, 1930, page 62, is quite true:

'All non-cooperative movements are based on similar fundamental principles, namely that the people should refuse to be part of councils which are run by the oppressing government and which are not genuine parliaments and they ought to make their own line of progress, whilst at the same time denying cooperation with the government. If non-cooperation in India was first based on the Hindu religion as its prime mover, even when the policy is applied in other countries it still has plenty of spiritual basis because it arises from the deep feeling in the hearts of all people who are struggling towards their own freedom.'[21]

If one studies the history of the emergence of the non-cooperation movement in Indonesia, it can be seen that it burst out as a policy of deep feeling, as a protest against the Netherlands who had broken the November promise of 1918.[22] Soon after this it could be seen that it had become a policy which arose out of pure common sense.

Even at this stage, the followers state that in colonial society there is no place for sentiment and pity, but every situation must be measured solely by the yardstick of reality and clear figures. In their turn, the non-cooperators would claim that their policies are based on reality, the reality being the condition of being a colony.

This reality seems different to them and to be more marked, in that the authority of the Netherlands in Indonesia is a reality which cannot be denied. But they are also fully aware that it is their own efforts without outside aid which form the main basis on which they will achieve national independence. In the last resort they have come to believe that nothing other than the solid will of the people will be capable of forcing the government in the Netherlands to ratify Indonesian independence at a later stage. When Minister de Graaff defended his law which was going to serve as the basic law in Netherlands Indies, he said that a real parliament would not yet be allowed because as yet there is no organisation of the people's will in Indonesia.

Well then, the non-cooperators are quite prepared to try and create an organised will of the people which will be regarded by this Minister as a condition necessary for parliamentary government. Unlike the views held by the Cooperators, they employ a critical attitude towards the government and cannot easily be lulled into quietness by such stories as that the Netherlands would be prepared gradually to liberate Indonesia of its own free will. They do not wish to continue to live on hope alone, merely trusting that the people in the Netherlands will at some time in the future alter their basic character and become a considerate nation. If this hope is in fact granted by God, then we can only say that the government is a very lucky one, because this is the only way it could come about.

The policy of non-cooperation, as I have stated earlier, – is based on the position of the real colonial status. Significant evidence of this status is to be found in the differences in the interests of the colonisers and the colonised, the clashes of will between this side and the other side. Here we can see in absolute clarity the ideals of the Indonesian people who wish to be independent. We can also see the aim of the Netherlands which is to continue her powers over Indonesia until the end of time.

The aims and ideals of the Dutch colonials were obvious at the question/answer session in the States General in 1925, when they were talking of the progress of the legal programme of Minister de Graaff which was expected to form the basic law of the Netherlands Indies. The policy now carried on by the non-cooperators was not with the intention of covering up the opposition but exposing it clearly so that it would awaken the spiritual attitude and strong will of the people, so that the people would know that any improve-

ment to come in their condition would have to come from them themselves.

The views of the non-cooperators were voiced by *Indonesia Merdeka*, from which I quote the following:

'Colonial society has destroyed the pysical and mental fibre of the people to such an extent that national life can only be improved by the efforts of the people themselves. If the people are to become aware of themselves, this must be done by making an immediate start at educating themselves so that they can recognise and acknowledge their own responsibility. This can never be done by cooperating with the government, the results of this cooperation being entirely unpredictable, because it is obvious that this would only aggravate the feeling of being incapable and would mean yet a further loss of self-confidence. It is only on the basis of one's own efforts, created by the existing force of the people, that one can pave the way to national consciousness. The policy of cooperation with the government does not create self-confidence, but, on the contrary, leads to a feeling of weakness in the people and doubts regarding their own ability. Such a policy compels the people to make compromises with a situation for which they are not responsible. The energy of the people, which should have been used for organising their own way of life, was allowed to flow away into a swamp and lose its power. It was said that a compromise had been made with the government, but in actual fact it was only a compromise in the sense that the people were giving way and following the will of the government. This policy was followed so skilfully by the government that they got away with it without evoking too strong a feeling of bitterness. In the end, these factors served as an invitation to laziness and this unwillingness became the reason why the people became soft and accepted whatever is offered to them with a patient shrug of the shoulders and a remark like "what else can one do?" It can be seen from all this that the policy of cooperation with the government takes the form of a policy which removes the virility of our nation'.

I have quoted the passage from *Indonesia Merdeka* in order to explain the basic policy of non-cooperation.

People have often criticised the non-cooperators on the grounds that their policy takes the form of a confused nationalist policy, the nature of which is very negative.[23] This attack has obviously been made without a proper knowledge of the truth, and it shows that they have not studied the basic principles on which we stand. It is a

criticism which has arisen usually on the basis of one point of evidence only, namely that the non-cooperators decided not to take part in the session of the Council.

From the psychological point of view, non-cooperation is nothing but a negative name for a positive fact. By their attitude of refusing to work together with the government, the non-cooperators intend to found an act of national self-activity and to strengthen the people's reliance in their own forces and capabilities. This is not something negative, it is not just refusing to go to meetings of the Council, it is not just refusing to take part in the decisions of policy. Instead, it is a positive act, an activity of self-help.

The non-cooperators are fully aware of the true fact that the influences of colonialism destroy the humane feelings of the people, eliminate self-confidence and plant in the minds of people doubts and inferiority complexes, feelings that the whites are superior beings and possess skills beyond all limits. For this reason they gain the conviction that independence will not come so long as the people compromise with such thoughts as 'never mind' and 'this is only fate, after all' and if they keep on believing that they can never progress or achieve any good fortune unless it is with the help of the Government. Therefore the main condition for the education of the people is to be social education, that is to say an education which liberates them from the colonial magic spell and which encourages them to be self-reliant.

This is the value of the policy of non-cooperation, which opens the eyes of the people so that they can know that their destiny can be improved whenever they themselves are prepared to roll up their sleeves and not just hope and wait for help from outside. The tactic of prohibiting attendance at meetings of the Council has proved extremely useful in that every association with the Government for building up national life and for creating doubts ragarding one's own ability has been eliminated. By ignoring the sessions of the Council, people are able to revive the spirit of human independence and self-reliance of the people so that they feel sure at last that Indonesia is capable of governing itself. But before this can come into being, people have to be free from feelings of inferiority complexes, free from insult. Only then will people expect to receive the results they have earned. According to the views of the non-cooperators, the independence movement is bound to achieve satisfactory results provided the people do away with any idea of their being inferior and lacking in self-confidence. Consequently the

non-cooperative weapon serves a double purpose: that of standing up to outside influences, and that of refreshing the inner spirit. To those who practice these fundamental principles, the policy of non-cooperation is a true discipline which will liberate the spirit of the people from colonial psychology, a psychology which for years has compelled them to obey everything in ignorance. Once the evil psychological spirit has been driven out of the minds of the people, the people will know the route they have to take in pursuit of independence. This is the message of the non-cooperators.

This is the general fundamental psychology of the non-cooperation movement. We will now delve a little more deeply into the fields of politics in regard to the government of the country and its effects in the social and economic spheres.

What I have just said will have told you sufficiently that non-cooperation in a political sphere takes the appearance of isolating itself from the councils of representation. Now there are many people who agree with a programme of self-action, but who suspect that non-cooperation should not necessarily take the path of boycotting the councils and that taking part in meetings of this kind does not necessarily mean cooperating with the Government. Cooperation – they say – is not just working together. Because, they say, attendance at these meetings could be used for the purpose of providing a strong opposition, for the purpose of withstanding government regulations which are capable of destroying the lives of people.

Is this true? The non-cooperator would say, Yes it is true that psychologically cooperation may be the same thing as attending Council meetings, but that in practice in colonial life this attitude cannot be adopted. Tactics of this kind can only be carried out if the people possess sufficient influence on the organisation of the Council itself. Is this the state of affairs which obtains in Indonesia?

If one is to understand the nature of the attitude of 'non-cooperation' in respect to the Council, it is necessary for us first of all to investigate the status of these Councils, because politics are not something just suspended in the air.

Let us now start by having a look at the Regency Council, the members of which are almost all Indonesian. Half of them plus one were elected members and the remainder – just like three other members who are non-Indonesian – are appointed by the Governor. The people who are allowed to vote are those who have a right to elect the village chief. This system has the appearance of ap-

proaching the system of a general election. But this is only an 'appearance'. The truth is that we are still very far away from that stage. The voting arrangements are organised in stages so that the people who have a right to vote only vote for a 'voter'. It is then these 'voters' who choose the members of the Regency Council. Those who are acknowledged as being sufficiently mature to be a 'voter' are those who are capable of reading and writing. Since there are about 93% of the people who have not been given by the Government the right to learn to read and write, the number of 'voters' is extremely small as compared with the number of the actual population. Consequently, by the arrangement by which elections are regulated, the clear will of the people is not shown in the elections to the Council. It will be obvious in practice that the members are elected from among the civil servants.

As regards the municipal council, this council is regarded as the native wing of the Dutch representation. Right from the very beginning it was decided that the Dutch representatives should be in a majority and that the arrangements for the election should be contrived in such a way that the majority of the people cannot have any part in the election of their 'representatives'.[24]

Something similar applies to the organisation of the Provincial Councils. In the very first place it was decided that the Dutch must have a very big influence in these councils. In the second place, the members, besides those appointed by the Governor-General, are selected by the Regency Councils and Municipal Councils existing in the province in question. Is it necessary for me to explain any further that the people cannot possibly have a voice in the Provincial Council?

The status of the National Council is such that a part of its members are chosen by the councils we have mentioned earlier, whilst the remaining part is appointed by the Governor-General. As a result of this it can be said that only a very small proportion of people are satisfied with this condition, and these are the educated Indonesian civil servants. The system has turned out to be nothing other than a kind of representation for the Upper Classes, and even then the only right they have is that of giving advice.

Because of the way the elections are organised stage by stage and on an average the right to vote is only exercised by the Upper Classes, the Indonesian people as a whole do not exert any influence on the organisation of 'their' Councils. Even though the people's movement took part in the struggle to get elections held,

the end result is that of only achieving two or three seats in those councils. Because everything starts from the top and works downwards, the voice of the People is not heard in all its strength. How can we possibly influence a policy of councils under conditions such as these. And how can we go about running national policy ourselves or prevent the Government carrying out actions which are regarded as being disastrous to the people?

These are the questions which the non-cooperators keep asking their opponents, so that there should no longer be anyone who is surprised to hear that the non-cooperators say that the policy of the National Council will never be successful. On the contrary, they think that to work in the Council could be dangerous because it is in itself deceptive and deceives the people. So long as the people still have no influence in the organisation of the Councils by the right to vote on a broad franchise, and as long as the Councils have no power which is similar to that of a real parliament – this is the advice of the non-cooperators – working in the Council will never be successful and merely be a waste of time for the Nation'.

The tactics of non-cooperation are now aimed at developing the education for the people, with self-help. This is not just some negative refusal to take part in a people's council. Because the Government does not provide a true People's Council, were they can express their own opinions and debate their own problems, the people themselves have to found their own Council. This is a continuation of their education in accordance with the principles of non-cooperation. In meetings, in associations and at congresses, there are places where the people can speak, can show their consciousness of their rights and their responsibilities. In this way the non-cooperators will create not only a political and legal awareness in the people, but also a sense of responsibility for the common good. And in this way they will be able to organise the expression of the people's will so that it can never be ignored by the Government. Consequently it may be said that in politics non-cooperation operates 'for organising a general awareness in politics and law'.

The second feature of non-cooperation, which is also of some value, is that which gives form and colour to self-help activities in the economic and social spheres.

Once the non-cooperators have obtained the confidence of the people in the rightness of their policies the people will realise that by rebuilding their national life they will achieve independence, as this can only be achieved by the growth of Indonesia itself.

As regards the social life of the Netherlands Indies, it is not a corporate body which is closed, but it consists of a number of political, social, economic organisations which are separate and can only find their joint action in the ideal of the Netherlands Colony and they are bound to be a group belonging to the Government of Netherlands India. Anyone who imagines himself as a traveller coming to this company from outside will then find that it first of all appears to him as an organisation of colonial administration, complete with its equipment, complete with its great modern highly organised cities, where the people from 'the other side' live. After this he will find there are tens of centres of trade which have relationships with one another. Everywhere in this little world he will find the breath of Western trade and the sign of American influence. Any job here is based on 'private enterprise'. If he walks further inside the company, the traveller will soon find that there are dozens of big enterprises and sugar, tea, quinine factories, coffee and tobacco plantations. Each of these enterprises has its own world complete with its own staff and regulations. Here everything looks up-to-date; the new inventions in the field of technology will soon be applied. The output and efficiency will be improved. In all these scattered societies there live the white men who seek a fortune and whose number is not more than 60,000 persons, if the Indo-Dutch communities are not counted in with them. And all these small worlds are scattered throughout a vast medium of an Indonesian nature, just like cases in the desert or like islands in a huge ocean.

If we put these two types of social life side by side we can soon see how different Indonesia looks and how pleasant its life can be as compared with that of the Netherlands Indies with its modern capitalism mentality. The progress of the latter moves strictly in accordance with the law of dynamics. Indonesian society remains quiet and sticks to the customs from one generation to another. Evidently the basic structure has the appearance of a large field in which thousands of small firms have their existence without any relationship with one another. The major part of the Indonesian economy merely tries to meet the needs of each group. A colonial economist, Prof. van Gelderen, describes the structure of the Indonesian economy as follows:

'Because of the geographical structure of Indonesia and social and psychological problems which have been in existence for many centuries, agriculture assumes greater importance than any other

activity. There is no willingness to undergo constant progress and to carry out technical research into the possibilities of improving the economic structure and the employment position. The character of the people in this country is such that they only want to have one direction of effort. They are devoid of imagination and static and prefer to continue to repeat the traditional way of working which has stood them in good stead for many centuries.'[25]

These are the differences between the two societies which are situated so closely side by side, so much so that their proximity can cause a social disease.

Whereas modern capitalism, being inoculated into the Indonesian body, has destroyed the lives of the people, this misfortune takes on tremendous dimensions because the Netherlands Indies overpowered Indonesian society by means of colonial government. Their policies have upset the social life as a result of two and a half centuries of consecutive rule by the East India Company and the system of cultivation was ruined from the very start. In the very beginning it was possible for the lives of the people to have been so wretched that they first of all could feel some improvement. Then private enterprise entered the country as a replacement for the cultivation system, and then the people could stand on their two feet no longer. Professor Boeke illustrates the misery which resulted from the clash between the West, which is individualistic and capitalistic, and the East, which is communalistic in nature:

'Liberal principles which promote the individual and the basic attack of capitalism have humbled Indonesia, much more than what has happened in Europe. The structure of society was destroyed and the weak were sent to the wall. We all know that capitalism entered Indonesia and grabbed and conquered within a space of only a few decades. There was more violence than in Europe, because the colonised islands offered so much of value to countries which had sufficient capital means, a great amount of technical knowledge and were always ready to fight. The economic policy, which opened the doors of Indonesia to strong-minded capitalists, the policy of communication which reduces the distance between countries and removes the sense of isolation and opens up the market to other competitors from outside so as to make trade competition within the country so much keener, the rules for paying taxes and the establishment of a western system of law courts, a policy of education – all these altered the organisation of the society of the natives to such an extent that there were many people who could no

longer stand upright. The trading partnerships were destroyed without being replaced by any new system, they were crushed without a replacement being built, all that was left was misery which destroyed the spirit of the people'.[26]

This is a general picture of the position of the struggle between Indonesia and Netherlands Indies. This picture illustrates how wretched are the lives of the Indonesians who are suffering from the attack by western capitalism, which possesses sufficient tools and instruments, all the means of modern power being used to strengthen the colonial power.

The non-cooperators regard all these facts as reasons why they have to carry out a policy of self-help.[27] They are convinced that independence will only come when the people have been able to improve and rebuild the Indonesian way of life and strengthen the spirit of the people. In this way non-cooperation can be seen as a method for bringing about the organisation of the lives of our people to fall in line with their national character. By fighting on their own, by being self-reliant and depending upon their own activities, especially in social and economic matters, the people ought to raise their own standard of living. In an independent country the people can always lean on the government which is responsible for the protection of the safety of the people, especially in a country with a parliamentary form of government. But in a colonised country, where the people do not possess their own government, they have to improve their own conditions of life. If they possess self-reliance, the ability to work will soon follow.

In the present colonial company, the big and organised hammer of western capitalism can only be welcomed by organising our own economy, based on cooperatives, with the ideal of helping one another in our venture together. By means of the cooperative movement, there are two genuine characteristics which will be strengthened, namely the individuality of the people and their feeling of solidarity. Non-cooperators believe strongly that by this means the economic and social life of Indonesia can be improved. With the development of economic strength, the people will strengthen their political force which friend nor foe can then overlook any longer.

The Dutch have often said that the educated Indonesians can no longer live happily in their own community because of their western education, so that they no longer have any constant basic principles and consequently are liable to be influenced all too easily by radical and revolutionary ideas.

Whoever has listened carefully to my talk will recognise that the revolutionary quality of Indonesian youth has nothing whatsoever to do with the problem of their being isolated from their own people, but it is because of the general awakening of the Eastern nations. This truth is nothing other than the result of the spirit of the day.

If those who are happy amongst us dedicate their lives and forces to the foreign world that dominates us and do not employ their efforts to building and developing a national life on the part of the people who really need them – and this is what non-cooperation is all about – how can their actions be said to be favouring the achievement of Free Indonesia?

The policy of non-cooperation has now revived the sense of responsibility in their hearts, it has awakened the free being inside them and shown them the way to their own national community. What is wanted is for them to be prepared to make sacrifices and not to live by pleasure alone, to try very hard to create new situations and not to work as automatons, but to know how to be responsible people and not to be useful instruments to the governing body.

That is the secret of non-cooperation. It should be easy to understand, even though it may be somewhat complicated in its outworkings. It is regarded by those who employ it as a system of general education in politics, economics and sociology – social education – one which is driven forward by self-confidence and based on self-activity. The road to freedom can be paved by the building of the national Indonesian nation and strengthening its own social organisation.

CONCLUSION

I have come to the end of my analysis. Although my general explanations have taken up a fair bit of time, probably too much time, I hope that I have been able to give a clear interpretation to you of the objectives and policy of the Indonesian Nationalist Movement.

That is about all I can say!

Speech *Doelstelling en Politiek van de Nationale Beweging in Indonesië* read to students of Indology at Utrecht in 1930, first published as a brochure in 1931.

1. Countries like China, Persia, Afghanistan, Siam, Liberia etc. all possess their freedom, but their economy is under the control of foreigners, namely white men, and furthermore there is also political control.
2. Previously, in accordance with the armistice agreement alle western men were free from the authority of the Turkish Government, but instead were responsible to their own Consul. Furthermore they did not pay any taxes to the Turkish Government even though they were allowed to stay there and to earn profit there. After Mustafa Kemal rejected the terms of the Armistice Agreement, this agreement was abolished at the Peace Conference in Lausanne in 1923.
3. Information regarding the basic principles and policies of the S.I. can be seen in *Koloniale Studiën,* from the year 1917, with explanations by Mr. Hasan Djajadiningrat and Mr. Abdul Moeis. See also in this book information regarding the other parties such as Insulinde, B.O. etc.
4. See *Indonesia Merdeka,* no. 1, 1924, p. 7.
5. In particular it will be observed here that the former Indian Movement is to suggest the policy of non-cooperation, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. There is also the Canton Movement led by Sun Yat Sen.
6. *De Socialist* of 19th October 1929; See the article entitled 'The P.I. and the Indonesian National Movement'.
7. I would agree with the 'historical process' theory only in the meaning of the law of evolution, namely that any human community structure is created as a result of associations in the past and these earlier associations are capable of creating situations which will determine the form of the future association.
   In his book *Het Rechtsgezag* Prof. Krabbe has altered the theory of 'Historisch Gewordene' (pp. 91-95). See also his book: '*Die moderne Staatsidee*'.
8. See: *Indonesia Merdeka* no. 1, 1924, p. 1.
9. Page 140 *et sqq.*
10. As Mr. Treub explains in his booklet '*Indië's Toekomst*', p. 12 *et sqq.*
11. The professors are C. van Vollenhoven, A. W. Nieuwenhuis, C. Snouck Hourgronje, Ph. S. van Ronkel, H. F. Colenbrander, the late G. A. J. Hazeu and N. J. Krom.
12. Taken from the article by Prof. van Vollenhoven in *Koloniaal Tijdschrift,* 1928, p. 383, under the title 'Het Grondgebied der Rechtsgemeenschappen overzee'.
13. That is the British, French, Germans, Italians, Poles, Czechs, Serbians, Irish etc.
14. Such as ships, aeroplanes, trains, telephones, telegraphs, radio, films etc.
15. In his book *The New World of Islam,* p. 132. This means that 'Nationalism is an expression of a belief in the existence of a nation'.
16. *Het Nederlandsch Staatsrecht,* Vol. II, p. 117.
17. In his book *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey,* page 181, he states 'All corporate action is based on the idea that objectives develop apace whilst the means to achieve them lag behind'.
18. According to the laws of psychology the cooperators certainly have more cause to be annoyed with the Government than do the non-cooperators, first and foremost because they have displayed patience and continued to cooperate with the Government in the hope that the Government would treat them honestly and fairly. They will feel a great sense of anger because they feel they have been cheated by the Government. The position is different with the non-cooperators. They have been cautious from the

very beginning. They do not feel any surprise if the Government does not fulfil its promises.

19. The information which we received about the basic principles of the P.R.I. was in the Dutch language. Consequently our version may differ from the words in Tabrani's translation. But the basic meaning of the two versions will be the same.
20. Callewaert, *Ierland en het Iersche Volk*, p. 576.
21. Any reader who wishes to know more details about the basic principles of non-cooperation should read the article entitled 'Non-cooperation' in *Indonesia Merdeka,* no. 4, 1930.
22. The story of the non-cooperation movement can be seen from my book *Indonesië Vrij* pp. 21, 41 *et sqq.* I wrote this as part of my defence in the Hague in the legal action against Perhimpunan Indonesia (Indonesian Union) in March 1928.
23. For example Daan van der Zee in *Het Volk,* July 19, 1930.
24. For the Gemeenteraad, the Provinciale Raad and the Volksraad it is laid down that each section of the population should elect its own representatives.
25. *Voorlezingen over tropisch-koloniale Staathuishoudkunde,* p. 7.
26. *Auto-activiteit naast autonomie,* p. 53 *et sqq.*
27. As a result of this statement the non-cooperators will never achieve their demand, namely Free Indonesia now. They firmly believe that Indonesia is capable of governing itself at the present time. They are convinced of their rights and of their own ability. But it is not possible to change reality, namely that the Netherlands still will not give Indonesia her freedom. That is why they are strugggling to save their very existence.

6 Propaganda

OUR FOREIGN PROPAGANDA

Foreign domination in our case has, among others, this most tragic effect: that foreign countries know so little of our national cause. This unfamiliarity leads as a rule to an unfavourable opinion about our existence and our ability to exist as a nation. Who can say that other countries do not think of us as still being a primitive people with no culture? In Europe one often hears talk – if we restrict ourselves to Asia – of the Chinese, the Indian, The Philipine, the Annamite problem, etc; but of Indonesia one scarcely hears anything at all. The outside world remains up to now ignorant of what goes on in our Fatherland. Consequently, it mistakenly believes that Indonesia greatly enjoys the 'blessings of Dutch Government'. One of the Dutch diplomatic representatives in a foreign country was able with impunity to declare that peace and quiet reign everywhere in Indonesia and that the population of 50 million 'is satisfied with the Dutch Government'. The national movement in our Fatherland, which is no less active and no less dangerous for the colonial regime than movements in other dominated countries, is almost unheard of in other countries. The tyrant has made sure that it is hidden from public opinion.

To the extent that foreign attention is directed at Indonesia at all, this is the result of propaganda by the opposition party, the Dutch capitalists who have an interest in attracting foreign capital for the exploitation of the colony. Thus the 'Dutch East Indies' – not Indonesia – is no longer an unknown quantity in the capitalist world. For their propaganda work the Dutch capitalists have not neglected to make use of foreign help. In any case, the opinion of an outsider usually appears to be imperial and reliable. So the Dutch capitalists found a man like Angoulvant – the president, please note, of a well-known sugar and cotton planting concern in

Indo-China which is associated with the Treub Javanese sugar syndicate – to write a book about 'The Dutch East Indies'. The result is recorded in a work of two bulky volumes. The material was supplied from government sources and by the interested capitalists themselves. It is moreover no secret that the Colonial Institute in Amsterdam took it upon itself to do a large part of the writing. Angoulvant's book, as such, is no more than a French copy of a Dutch work. Let us also add that Angoulvant was appointed to the rank of Commander of the Order of Orange Nassau, the work of the Colijn Ministry, and every right-thinking person will know what value to put on Mr. Angoulvant's impartiality, of which he is so anxious to boast at the end of his book. We are therefore not surprised when this creature of Dutch capitalism closes his book with the following utterance:

'Holland can from now on display to civilised nations the material fruits of its maginficent effort and of the liberalism of its native policy. If all human work is subject to error, if action inevitably attracts criticism, *the independent expert who has studied in detail, as I have done*, (*sic.* Author, our italics) the colonization of the Archipelago, can only pay sincere homage to what has been accomplished, only proclaim the effectiveness of the methods adopted. only bear witness to the loyalty and honesty, the intelligence, the boldness and hard work of the settlers, can only foresee for this immense empire, conquered and developed by one of the smallest nations of Europe, the finest of destinies'.

One can see here how badly the truth is outraged. Thus can the outside world form an opinion about our country which turns out greatly to our disadvantage. Up against this propaganda so fatal to us we must from our side produce other propaganda for the *Indonesian State*, which is engaged in forming itself on the territory which is called the 'Dutch East Indies' by our opponents.

Indonesian youth in Europe, united under the banner of *Perhimpoenan Indonesia*, has long understood how essential it is to produce propaganda abroad for our own national cause. It has been able to observe from the history of peoples that foreign propaganda is an indispensable element in the struggle for national independence. In this connection one does not even have to go far back in history. One can already learn lessons from the struggles for freedom of the countries that have become independent since the Great War. At the same time one can learn from these that the community of nations in its present aspect makes new demands on its member nations. In order

to be able to rule itself, a nation must show the world that it has an earnest will to do so. A people that lacks this quality is doomed to be dominated forever. This is simply the iron law of modern society.

Our foreign propaganda must be understood from this point of view. We must endeavour to avoid foreign ignorance of our claim to nationhood which leads to the opinion that Indonesia has not the will to be free. In the past ten years our nation has unceasingly made this will manifest. It is our task to bring this fact within reach of public opinion.

Our foreign propaganda must keep in step with the significance of our Fatherland in international intercourse. Through its economic-geographic position, as a borderland of the Pacific, which is fast becoming one of the power fulcra in world politics, Indonesia poses a problem which is controlled above all by international political relations. Thus our foreign propaganda proceeds in two kinds of direction. Where the problem of our freedom is inseparably connected with the South Seas question, it is in our interest to mount propaganda for the idea of Asian solidarity. For, in this flashpoint of world politics, the interests of the imperialist powers collide with those of the enslaved peoples of Asia. Only an Asia that feels united is in a position to offer resistance to the brutal penetration of the white barbarians from the distant West.

We must congratulate ourselves on the fact that our work of propaganda in this direction continues to be accompanied by success. As is always the case with such propaganda, we began by seeking personal contact with Asians of other nationalities. And in this process similar, but sometimes still latent, ideas immediately meet each other, ideas which have to ripen into a tangible result. An association of Asians, called the Association for the Study of Oriental Civilizations[1] was formed in Paris last year. Messrs. Cheng Yin Shang, and Ting Tsao Ching were the founders. Although this association concerns itself mainly with the study of Eastern cultures, it does not lack political elements within it. And it is these elements with whom we cooperate in the second area of our foreign propaganda: making our Fatherland known abroad and establishing world attention on our national rights.

Our first joint path led to the 'VIth International Democratic Congress', which was held in August last year in Bierville (near Paris).

In this beautiful corner of the land of the French, rich in fresh greenery, the pacifists of the West met for the sixth time to talk about the cause of peace and the brotherhood of peoples. This

congress differed from the five previous congresses in that it was more universal. No less than 31 nations were represented there. Whilst the five previous congresses were held under the banner of European reconciliation, of which the pivot was the question of Franco-German rapprochement, the Bierville congress was aware of another important problem, on which the achievement of universal peace much depends, the Asiatic problem. For the first time the Western pacifists saw Asia represented at their congress. And for the first time they heard Asia's voice, declaring in clear language that no lasting peace is possible as long as the suppressed peoples are not freed from the foreign yoke.

Although the presence of the people from the lands of the rising sun was at first a surprise for the Western pacifists it slowly dawned upon them that their activity had helped to broaden their political horizon. They learn more consciously to understand that the solution of the European question by itself is far from being enough to reach their ultimate goal, universal peace and the brotherhood of men. The interest in Asia which many leading members of the congress revealed outside congress session times bears witness to this. The Asian delegates had no complaints about this interest. interest. They were so overwhelmed with questions that they scarcely had the time to answer them all. The Asian bloc at the Bierville congress consisted of the delegates from Annam, Azerbaijan, China, India, Indonesia, and Siam, these being respectively Messrs. Duong van Giao, Ali Akbar Bey Topchybachy, Tung Meau, K. M. Panikkar, Mohammad Hatta and P. Montri. Owing to the time available the Asian Delegation felt obliged to nominate one of their number as general representative, who spoke on behalf of Asia, while the others were able to restrict themselves to the discussion of their national problems. The Indian delegate, K. M. Panikkar, was nominated as general representative and his speech was later published by the Asiatic group as a manifesto.[2]

Thanks to its activity, the Asian Delegation achieved the adoption of the following motions:

1. 'The Congress,
   Considering that the world economic crisis will not be checked without the help of Asia, that this help will not be possible unless Asian peoples are left free to work at the task of reconstruction, of civilization and of Peace;

> Considering, moreover, that the oppression of peoples is contrary to international justice,
> Demands as an essential condition for the collaboration of the nations of the world absolute respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, without distinction of race or belief.'

2. 'Considering that a universal and permanent peace is not possible without the liberation of oppressed peoples,

the Congress gives a mandate to the various national delegations to work in their respective countries towards the liberation of oppressed peoples.'

Both these very far-reaching motions were adopted by the Congress by unanimous vote. This fact implies not only the recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination but likewise the justification of every struggle towards the overthrowing of the colonial regime. For the rest, the text of both motions leaves nothing in clarity to be desired except that it is considered necessary to add a more comprehensive explanation to it.

Now, as for our cause. If we took an active part in the International Democratic Congress at Bierville it is not because we subscribe to the methods of the Western democrats towards the realisation of universal peace (which, in our view, are ineffective for general application) and thereby derogate our own revolutionary principle, at present based on resistance to government. No! Our presence at Bierville had only this reason, that we wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to show the Western democrats the unbreakable bond between every humanitarian principle and the revolutionary struggle for national independence.

At the same time we wished to make use of this timely occasion for the propaganda of our holy cause.

As the first fruit of this propaganda it must be mentioned that the name 'Indonesia' for our fatherland was *officially* recognised by the Congress. This recognition, taken together with both the motions adopted, entails the consequence that our work for the building of the independent Indonesian State is morally supported by the Congress.

The first step in the direction of making our country known abroad has thus been taken. With this first beginning we have restricted ourselves to scouting out the lay of the land. We must not remain there. On the foundations of the results achieved we must continue this useful work with redoubled energy. And the place

which the Congress conferred upon our delegates has given us hope that in the coming years we will have ample opportunity to lodge a plea for our national claims. And we shall then also not neglect to denounce the lying propaganda of the tyrant and expose his crimes against the rights of men.

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, 1926.

1. The first manifestation of the Association occurred with the organization of an Oriental Art Fair, which took place in Paris on 12th February 1925. Conscious of the usefulness of cultural propaganda, our own association, Perhimpoenan Indonesia, gave its full cooperation to this initiative.
   See an appreciation of this fair in *Indonesia Merdeka* no. 2, year 4.
   That our rulers also nursed fears about this kind of propaganda is borne out by the fact that the Indonesians studying at Government expense who contributed to the production of a special Indonesian issue in Paris in April last year, at the request of the French Association of Friends of the Orient, were put on the carpet by the so-called councillor of students at the Colonial Office to account for their 'crimes'. They were supposed to have been guilty of anti-Dutch propaganda. That even to take part in a *purely cultural* production is forbidden to them is characteristic of the mentality of the Blanda (Javanese word for Dutch) ruler.
2. This manifesto follows as appendix I to this article. As appendices II and III we also print our own delegate's speeches at the congress.

APPENDIX I. MANIFEST OF THE ASIATIC DELEGATION AT THE BIERVILLE CONGRESS FOR PEACE

Asia and Peace. There is one thing which cannot fail to strike any one who studies the peace movements of Europe. It is the fact – which even your deliberations to day have emphasied – that when European people think of peace they think of it only in terms of Europe. In the imagination of European thinkers the world seems to be confined to the areas inhabited by European races. The vast continent of Asia containing as it does some of the most ancient civilisations and holding the vast majority of the human population. Africa with its particular problems does not seem to come into the picture at all. This, we submit with all humility, is a wrong point of view. If the world is to have permanent peace it must not be a local peace, a peace affecting only a few nations, but extending its beneficent reign over the whole of human kind.

Even from the point of view of Europe, the strategic centre of

peace is Asia. It is there that European conflicts are developing. Those who believe that the progress of humanity can come not by diplomatic alliances and understanding but by the organisation of society on the basis of justice and mutual toleration can easily see that the peace of Europe itself is threatened by the complications in Asia. The rivalry of European nations and the subjection of the Asiatic people constitute in our opinion the greatest dangers to world peace. Everywhere in Africa and in Asia European nations are competing with each other in an unholy race for the imperialistic exploitation of weaker peoples.

To our European friends of peace the raid of a few irregulars into the territory of Yugo-Slavia is of greater importance than a war in Mecca.

In China the conflicting interests and the clash of imperialist designs of various European powers have created a chaos which is in itself the negation of peace; while we talk here of establishing world peace, the European nations are subsidizing warfare in China, each to support its own interests and as if to proclaim to the world that these rivalries can end only in war, the dockyard-fortifications of Singapore are raising their menacing head. The *Angel of peace* is indeed wellnigh strangled in the vice-like grip of Imperialism, which, sitting entrenched in the subject populations of Asia, extends its tentacles to the nerve centres of European life.

The subjection of Asiatic people – of the population of India, Egypt, Indo-China, Indonesia, the economic and political subordination of China are equally a menace to lasting peace. The shadowy peace which foreign governments establish by the force of their bayonets is no peace at all. It is merely peace by terrorism. Such a peace is worse than war, because it raises in the hearts of men hatred – blazing uncontrollable hatred – which some time or other is likely to burst out. All have noticed how the European is hated throughout the East. Why? Is it because the Asiatics – the Chinese, the Indians, or the Egyptians are a barbarous people? No; but because all over Asia we feel that we are being held down mercilessly by the force of superior arms. Is this accumulation of hatred, which, though we may deplore, we cannot deny an asset for peace, or is it its greatest enemy? If you wish for peace, your first work should be to eliminate the causes which make Asia hostile towards Europe and to dissolve this vast accumulation of hatred. Establish a brotherhood of cooperation between Asia and Europe and you would have taken the biggest step towards peace.

What is it that stands in the way of such a cooperation; it is the union of European powers for the exploitation of Asia and for the subordination of new peoples. European nations have indeed their rivalries against each other in Asia, but as against Asiatics they are one. All rivalry is sunk in a common desire for radical domination when it is a question of white-manity against humanity. In the thought and mental background of European peoples here is already in existence a racial war. In Asia it is not the Englishman or the Frenchman or the Dutchman, but the European as against the Asiatic that exists. In a recent book written by a liberal thinker Sir Leo Chiozza Money the argument is frankly put forward that Great Britain should not give selfgovernment to India because it would weaken the position of other European races. Mark you, this argument. Great Britain in her relations with India is asked to take into consideration not the interests of India, of England or of humanity but of other European peoples.

Sir Leo Money is right. The whole problem of Asia centres round Great Britain's position in India. We do not want to say a word here about the relations between India and England; but to every student it must be clear that the problem of Asiatic peace is, if we may so express, the problem of the Indian triangle. India is so placed geographically that any power which holds her can extend its influence to all sides. From the North-West frontier it can control Central Asia. From Burma it can extend its influence to South China, Siam or Indo-China. The Indian sea from Singapore to Aden is entirely under its control. Indeed it is the triangular geographical formation of the British Empire in India, that is the main problem, which lovers of peace have to solve. It is this, that in the freedom of India lies the keystone of world's peace.

Liberate the spirit of Asia and you will have peace – not a peace imposed by the sword, but a peace based on good will. The spirit of Asia is essentially pacific. In India we have rediscovered – after many centuries – the great doctrine of *Ahimsa* or non-violence of which Mahatma Gandhi is the Apostle. The whole religion of Buddhism is based on this idea. Wherever Buddhism has permeated, the spirit of peace is held in greater honour than the spirit of war. Help to liberate that spirit and you would have achieved your object.

At the present time the people of Asia are unable, because they are bound down, to put their whole weight into the cause of peace. And, friends, let it not be forgotten that a progress which excludes the vast majority of human beings and affects only a fraction, can never be

permanent. Can it be that Europe can progress without Asia? Can it be that whatever progress so achieved by the unaided efforts of Europe can be safeguarded without the cooperation of Asiatic people? So if you earnestly desire peace, if you honestly desire to see a better state of affairs in the world, help in the movement for the freedom of the vast majority of the human race which is now bound down to dependence. Thus alone can peace be achieved. Let China, India and the rest of Asia be free. Then you would have built up a family of free people willing to live together in cooperation and more than that, you would have eliminated the most potent causes of war.

The Asiatic delegation at the Bierville congress for Peace:

Duong Van Giao, *delegate from Annam.*
Toptchybachy, *delegate from Azerbaidjan.*
Tung Meau, *delegate from China.*
K. M. Panikkar, *delegate from India.*
Mohammad Hatta, *delegate from Indonesia.*

APPENDIX II. INDONESIA AND PEACE

A speech made to the VIth International Democratic Congress for peace at Bierville, by Mohammad Hatta, Indonesian delegate.

Comrades,

I ask the Congress kindly to accept the respectful compliments of Indonesian youth, whom I have the honour to represent here. And from the bottom of my heart, in their name, I thank the Committee which has given me the opportunity to address the meeting. This is doubtless the first time you have heard of Indonesia; I hope it will not be the last.

Indonesia is the name of the Sunda archipelago, composed of Sumatra, Java, Borneo, the Celebes and other islands, with a population of more than 50 million inhabitants, situated between the continent of Asia and Australia, near the Philippines.

The aim that this Congress envisages is lofty and noble. It wishes to give the world universal peace. I am happy to be able to declare that in its admirable endeavour the Congress can count on Indonesian youth. Because no one desires peace more ardently than we do. We Indonesians are a pacifist people whose dearest wish is to work in peace and to contribute to the progress of humanity. During the

course of our history it has always been peace that we have sought. We have indeed suffered wars that once ravaged our country. We are convinced that it is only in a lasting peace that one can harvest the fruits of one's labour. Thus it is right to say, with *La Jeune Republique* (issue of 13th August) in its article entitled 'The work of peace; politics is not enough for everything', that the 'social elite, both idealistic and utilitarian, of the various nations must get together and act to awaken in the spirits of men the feeling of human solidarity, to guide the reform of international institutions towards the progressive reinforcement of this solidarity'. But for such a solidarity to be achieved and for peace to be lasting it must be based on the brotherhood of men; this brotherhood is the cornerstone of universal peace. Brotherhood in peace can only exist among equals; therefore people must be treated on an equal footing, so that peace can be assured. A people must be free to take part in this great work for peace. The seed of peace needs clement weather to sprout and it must be harvested in the serenity of soul of a people who enjoy their freedom. But the tree of peace dies in the storm of battle for this primordial need of each people, its independence.

The cause of universal peace is the cause of independence for the nations. Whoever desires peace desires the freedom of peoples. In the hearts of people excluded from human society there is only hatred on which it is impossible to erect the monument of peace. To build in this way is to build on sand; the edifice that is built threatens at any moment to collapse on our heads. We must therefore start to cast a solid base, the mutual respect that freedom gives.

For a nation to be free it is enough that it should want to be so. This desire which the people of Indonesia are today expressing is an important stage for universal peace. Universal peace is the goal towards which every human endeavour is directed, it is the end of a long road. It cannot be the first stone or the first building to built. We cannot skip any stages but must go forward slowly, meet all the preliminary conditions and the ripe fruit will fall into our outstretched hand.

The people of Indonesia are a colonised people who know pain and suffering. Crushed by poverty, limited in their most sacred rights, they hold out their hands for the freedom that will save them. For them freedom is not a question of more or less, it is like death: it is or it is not. If one puts 'reservations' on it, it is no longer freedom. But the people of Indonesia believe in a better future when they will live in brotherhood among free nations. The

political movement that has unfolded since the beginning of this century is only a fraction of the eternal endeavour of humanity towards a better life.

As in all oppressed countries it was intellectual youth, their hearts steeped in the highest ideals, that inaugurated the national movement. The victory of Japan over Russia echoed in their hearts, and this was the cause of the founding of the first political association within the walls of the medical school in Batavia. A new stage along this route was the founding of the Indonesian National Party which, in spite of the prohibition of meetings, launched the idea of a free fatherland. It was soon followed by the Sarikat Islam, a party based on religion.

At that time the people of Indonesia believed that they could achieve their goal by demanding a new constitution. We asked then for the meeting of a national assembly and we declared ourselves ready to give our collaboration to the Dutch government. In asking for a parliament for the country we wanted to conform to the democratic principle of government. And up to the end of the world war the people of Indonesia in fact believed in the Western democratic spirit. It considered the great war as a defence of democracy and justice. The right of peoples to self-determination, which Mr. Wilson proclaimed, aroused hopes. The people of Indonesia also believed that the promise of November 1918 would be carried out by the Dutch government which was then in the midst of a political crisis – in Holland there was the threat of the socialist revolution led by Mr. Troelstra. This famous promise contained a programme of political reforms. But far from fulfilling what was solemnly promised, a new colonial regime was created with a marked reactionary tendency. Allow me to quote article 153 (2) and 153 (3) of the Dutch East Indies Penal Code so as to show you how government terror reigns in Indonesia.

Art. 153 (2):

'Whosoever by word, writing or image, even indirectly or in secret or couched in veiled terms, intentionally encourages or militates in favour of a disturbance of public order or the subversion of the established authority in the Netherlands or in the Netherlands East Indies, or who attacks the aforesaid authority will be punished by imprisonment for a maximum of 6 years or by a fine of a maximum of 300 florins (i.e., about 4500 francs).'

Art. 153 (3):

'Whosoever, with a view to giving publicity therefor or increas-

ing publicity therefor, distributes, exposes or openly posts a written document or image, by any means even if indirectly or in secret or couched in veiled terms has encouraged or militated in favour of a disturbance of public order or of the subversion of the established authority in the Netherlands or in the Dutch East Indies or has attacked the aforesaid authority, will be punished by imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years or by a fine of a maximum of 300 florins.'

All this shows that the colonial policy of Holland is far from being in harmony with what one can call international morals. The prohibition of public or private meetings, the censorship of the press, the prohibition from striking to secure a better economic existence and then the absence of labour legislation have nothing that remind us of a democratic regime. And is there a more serious threat to the democratic principle than this exorbitant right of the governor-general to deport any person whom he considers 'dangerous to the country', even when the judge has no reason to convict since such person has committed no crime? Such a regime only provokes a bellicose spirit which breaks the most fraternal relations between peoples. Where there is no justice there is no peace.

It is clear that if we wish to secure universal peace, we must first suppress the colonial regime that maintains injustice. *Colonisation in Asia does not make sense!* What is the attitude of Indonesian youth towards the colonial fact? This youth, the hope of the future, undergoes the most painful suffering which is the spectacle of the misery of a people. This harsh reality makes the flower of idealism whither in their hearts. This is why the Indonesian youth movement is directed towards a work for the liberation of the people; this so that freedom and love can in the end install themselves in their conscience. It has understood that without freedom it cannot achieve the noblest thoughts of humanity. This intellectual youth puts the national question and clearly expresses its will on the matter. The fight which it offers to the colonial regime is the fight for democracy. When the democratic principle penetrates this regime, freedom, equality, brotherhood, love, in short, universal peace will not be long in coming. A harmonious relationship will be established between nations and this will be the good fortune of human kind.

This goal must be ours, Comrades! It depends on our will, on our sincerity, on our devotion to the highest cause of humanity. Let us not despair, humanity can be better. Because we know its past, we

must have confidence in its future. Our immediate task is to fight anything that may impede the approach of universal peace. And each step made in this direction is a step towards civilisation.

To conclude let me recall the words of Turgot: 'To stand still before a fallacy that one can fight against is a crime against reason. To stand still before an injustice that one can fight against is a crime against humanity.'

It is only from this point of view that one can understand the basis of the revolutionary tendency of Indonesian youth.

APPENDIX III. SPEECH

Given at the Grand Closing Banquet of the VIth International Democratic Congress for Peace on the 22nd of August by Mohammad Hatta, Asian delegate, Indonesian division.

Comrades,

Now that most of the pilgrims of peace are to leave Bierville, where we have worked for a week for the greatest cause of humanity, I feel the need to say a few words. I will not take long, because I have already had the opportunity to explain to you the feeling and opinion of Indonesian youth regarding universal peace.

Firstly, I cannot go without thanking our excellent Chairman, Marc Sangnier, for his tireless efforts for peace and for the preparation of the Congress, where for the first time the voice of Asia has been heard.

Here at Bierville we have spoken of peace, we have formulated resolutions and we have discussed prior conditions which have to be fulfilled so that peace may be lasting and the brotherhood of peoples may be achieved.

Although I came to Bierville with a little scepticism – and I say so frankly – I am now happy to be able to vouch for your truly pacifist spirit and to have the certain proof that you all condemn the colonial regime.

And you, European comrades, you have heard the Asian delegates who have told you frankly what they think about the future of peace and of humanity. From everything that we have said you can conclude that no one desires more ardently than we do. You have been able to establish that we Asians are pacifists by nature. Now that the spirit of nationalism reigns in all the countries of

Asia, Mr. Henri de Jouvenal proposes (*De Telegraaf*, Dutch newspaper) to the people of Europe that they should form a united front against this nationalism, which is still only defensive.

Yet there is a difference between your work for peace and ours. You, European youth, enjoy freedom. You can start working immediately for universal peace and the brotherhood of peoples. Although you are not yet a large enough number to be able to achieve at once this lofty ideal of mankind, you already have all the required conditions to get there. The result of your work must come in time. But up to the present things are otherwise for us. There is something that hinders us from working immediately for universal peace. By the fact that we are not free, that we are a colonized and oppressed people, we are constrained first of all to work for our own national freedom and to save our Fatherland from the yoke of western imperialism. Freedom is a condition sine qua non for all peoples if they are to achieve the common goal, that is, universal freedom and the Brotherhood of Man. In consequence, our struggle for freedom is at the same time a struggle for democracy and for humanity.

Yesterday I said in my speech to the Plenary Session that if we wish for peace we must first of all suppress the colonial regime in Asia which maintains injustice. And you are in agreement with me that without justice peace is not possible.

This, European comrades, is the difference between our tasks. You can see that our road to universal peace is longer than yours. Our immediate job is to achieve the basic condition for it, that is, our national independence.

But the fact that we are pacifist peoples and that our civilizations are based on the humanitarian ideal can give you the assurance that our final goal is universal peace, to work in peace and to contribute to the progress of humanity in brotherhood.

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, 1926.

7 The Brussels Congress against Imperialism and Colonial Oppression and our foreign propaganda

When in our Oct-Nov. edition of *Indonesia Merdeka* of last year we offered a review of our foreign propaganda at the International Democratic Congress in Bierville, we approximately said at the end: 'The first move in the process of publicising our home country abroad has been made. To start with we have limited ourselves to a reconnoitre. We must not stop at this. On the basis of results achieved we shall continue this useful work with double energy'.

Scarcely three months had passed since we had written these lines when a new opportunity arose for propaganda on a larger scale. This time a propaganda offensive in great style! On the initiative of the 'League against Colonial Oppression' an international Congress took place in Brussels from 10th-15th February of this year, which was one of the most important, if not *the* most important that our century has witnessed. It was the first congress against imperialism and colonial oppression!

In his review of this congress in the *Groene Amsterdammer* of 19th February of this year Dr. Jan Romein characterised this event as follows: 'It does not happen each day, not even every ten, twenty, or fifty years, that an event occurs which, as it were, suddenly illuminates a development and makes us measure the distance mankind has progressed since a similar previous event'. The aforementioned writer compared this Congress against Imperialism and Colonial Oppression with the Berlin Congress, the starting point of modern imperialism. It is indeed interesting to learn the opinion of an outsider on the Brussels Congress. And therefore we quote Dr. Jan Romein further. '15 November 1884 in Berlin, the Congo Conference summoned by Bismarck began, to which all European governments, with the exception of Switzerland and the Balkan States, sent representatives. It lasted until the 26th February 1885 and in the intervening months decided the fate of Africa. The Franco-German co-operation at the conference broke the

hitherto unchallenged English colonial supremacy. In the end only the creation of the "independent" Congo state under the sovereignty of the Belgian merchant-king Leopold II proved to be a permanent measure of the conference: but the fact that this conference was an "event" in the sense intended above does not make it any less important: From their own positions of strength European powers decided here upon the fate of a part of the world, without a thought for its interests, let alone an ear for its representatives.

10th Feb. 1927. The congress against colonial oppression and imperialism summoned by the preparatory commission of the "League against colonial oppression and imperialism" assembles in Brussels in the Egmont-Palace, the name of which – as the 76-year old Ledebour reminds us – brings to mind another struggle for freedom of long ago. The name, and surroundings too, because the Egmont Palace is close to the park where statues of, for instance, William the Silent and Marnix of St. Aldegonde stand surrounded by figures of fishermen and craftsmen, the supporters and perpetrators of the Dutch rising against Spain. This Congress in Brussels illuminated the situation in 1927 just as sharply as the abovementioned Berlin Conference had done with the situation of more than 40 years ago.'

Thus Dr. Jan Romein.

Should we be surprised then if this event caused a stir in the imperialist world? The imperialist press cried out for all they were worth, alarming and warning, as if to say that the Congress had come from the Soviet Republic. With this they aimed to frighten off the *pur sang* nationalists from various colonised countries so that they would hold themselves aloof from the congress. But this was not the only propaganda against the Brussels Congress. Ideas to make it fail were not lacking. It was also alleged that this congress originated from German imperialists who hankered after colonial possessions for Germany. They would then be able to compel the great Powers to return to Germany its old colonies. The proof was that the secretariat consisted almost entirely of Germans. And so no stone was left unturned to make the Congress against colonial suppression look suspicious. The intention was clear. What was to be achieved by all this was that the nationalists from various colonial countries would stay away from the congress so that the dreaded 'coloured Front' would not come about. But all that whining and agitation could not prevent representatives of suppressed peoples from all corners of the world from flooding into the Belgian

capital for the discussion of the common target. However, although the preparations were not in the least brilliant, there were present at the congress no less than 37 organisations from 34 countries with 175 members entitled to vote. The parliaments of Canton and Mexico were officially represented too. Proof indeed that the time was ripe for a world congress of this type.

For a period of five days the world had before it an international congress where not only representatives from suppressed peoples with all their variety of race and colour came together, but also delegates from European and American trade unions; and pacifists, anti-militarists, socialists and communists. Also well-known learned people like Prof. Theodor Lessing and Prof. Alfons Goldschmidt took an active part in the deliberations while the famous Prof. Einstein consented to be made honorary President. But however colourful and diverse the races and political colours, in purpose and aspiration people were of one mind. Never before had the world seen such a congress gather, where the exploited and suppressed coloured races together with the white workers' organisations and other anti-imperialist groups formed a united front against world imperialism. For five days the accusations of suppressed peoples against the acts of violence resounded in colourful variety, and protests against the violations of human rights by that great monster called world imperialism. It would take us too far if we had to give a detailed account of all that was discussed and decided at the congress. We have too little space at our disposal for this. We must restrict ourselves to mentioning the role played by our delegation at this congress and the results which this second foreign propaganda event has attained for our native country.

To start with we must observe that Indonesia was represented at the Congress by our *Perhimpunan Indonesia* authorized by the National Concentration in our native country, and by the *Sarikat Rakjat.* Our delegation under the leadership of Mohammad Hatta consisted, apart for the chairman himself, of Nazir Pamontjak, Gatot, Achmad Subardja and Abdul Manaf, the latter for the Egyptian section of our P.I. Sarikat Rakjat was represented by Semaoen. As has already been remarked by a *blanda*-paper the Indonesian delegation at the congress against colonial oppression did not play a silent role. The head of our delegation was given a seat in the Praesidium of the Congress, thanks to our longstanding relationship with the *Liga gegen koloniale Unterdrückung.* And while the Congress was in progress Semaoen too was taken up into

the Praesidium, so that Indonesia had two representatives. Taking into account that most delegations are not represented at all, one can state that this was for us a very important advantage.

Our foreign propaganda in Brussels is one of the most important things we have done so far in this direction. And thanks to the rising on the west coast of West Java and Sumatra world attention is being drawn to our native land. And immediately the tide of public opinion turned against Dutch colonial politics. Until recently, as a result of the propaganda of the rulers, one heard nothing but fine words from the Dutch administration in Indonesia, and now one hears from the mouths of that enslaved population itself that white terrorism prevails in this country of unlimited possibilities, that extortions and hideous maltreatment are the order of the day. That the Indonesian population has been taken advantage of and exhausted for more than three centuries. That the total impoverishment is the greatest 'blessing' of Dutch 'good' colonial government. At first people did not want to believe it. But recent events in Indonesia are opening the eyes of the outside world to the prevailing bad state of affairs.

We have mainly the recent rising in our native country to thank for the fact that the Indonesian problem took up an important position in the discussions at the Brussels Congress. When on the second evening of the Congress Nazir Pamontjak, chosen head speaker of our delegation gave his maiden speech he was being listened to with the closest attention.

It is important to just mention here the acceptance by the Congress of the resolution put forward by our delegation with the following content:

The Congress against Imperialism and colonial oppression, held from 10-15 February 1927 in Brussels; having heard an exposition of the general state of affairs in Indonesia and taking into account that:

1. the purchasing power of the Indonesian population has decreased by at least 15%;
2. workers' wages are about 15% of European wages;
3. vital interests of the population, especially education and public health, are being dreadfully neglected;
4. organisations and parties who fight this sad state of affairs are being threatened with violence, for instance the 'Sarikat Rakjat'

(workers party) and the Trade Union of Railway employees have been forbidden to meet;
5. The so-called democratic 'reforms' are in reality just a means which Dutch imperialists use to further suppress and deceive the population;
6. the political terrorism of Dutch governers falsely labels every opposition as 'communist' or 'muscovite'.
7. The foreign policy of neutrality of Dutch imperialism does not satisfy under the present circumstances in the Far East the interests of any of the imperialist powers, but on the contrary awakens in them a longing to own the strategically so important Indonesia; thus Indonesia in Dutch possession has become a factor for a new world war, the danger of which can only be alleviated by revolutionary freedom movements in Indonesia;

having considered these facts,

declares, that a freedom movement has become a necessity for survival for the Indonesian population and at the same time a matter of importance to mankind;
and resolves:
1. to give the fullest sympathy to the Indonesian freedom movement and to support this movement with all possible power;
2. to demand from the Dutch government: complete freedom for the Indonesian population, abolition of exile and death sentences and the issue of a general amnesty. –

Besides this motion our delegation made a statement, whereby in the name of the national freedom movement it declared its sympathy for revolution in China led by the Kuo-Min-Tang party and at the same time decided to oppose any imperialist act of war in China. Another important decision for our home country taken by the congress was to request from the Dutch Government permission to let a commission consisting of Nansen, Bernard Shaw, and Barbusse render an account of the situation in Java and Sumatra and decide whether the recent rising was caused by communist agitation or the social misery in which the population finds itself. It depends only on the Dutch Government whether this commission will be able to carry out its work or not. As we are aware, the Dutch Indonesian Government has already appointed a commission, consisting of Government officials, with the purpose of looking into the causes of the rising. Judging by its character this *Government*

commission will not be without prejudice. In the light of this we are most interested to know to what extent the Dutch Government honestly wants an impartial inquiry: will it allow an impartial private commission as envisaged by the Praesidium of the Congress to investigate. In connection with the motion presented by our delegation, at the suggestion of the Praesidium, it was decided amidst applause from the Congress to send a telegram to the Dutch Government with the following content:

'– The Congress against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism reminds the Dutch Government of the oppression suffered by the Indonesian people for centuries, and

points out to the Government that the oppression has awoken the justifiable anger of the Indonesian population

and desires therefore the abolition of exile, prison and death sentences pronounced over those who have resisted oppression in Java and Sumatra, and also a general amnesty for those prosecuted. –'

These are the results which our second foreign propaganda drive has been able to achieve. Our national cause has been sufficiently spotlit and promoted which cannot be said of all countries. Now Indonesia is more than ever known and recognised in the world community. We have established friendship ties with other representatives of colonised and suppressed peoples which will be of lasting value in the most distant future. Our delegation can therefore leave the Congress with an easy mind and with satisfaction. The results achieved afford even greater satisfaction if we consider that with the modest means which our union has at its disposal we are in a position to do something great for our native country. And we have with this at the same time proved to our people that our *Perhimpunan Indonesia* is worthy to bear the name which was once given to it from the way-out post of the National movement in the cold North.

A second milestone in our foreign propaganda has been reached. A new base for further action. Our task becomes ever more difficult, but at the same time more agreeable. May we be given the strength in the future to build further on the foundation of what has already been achieved.

We cannot finish our review without devoting a word to what could be called the crowning of the work of the Congress against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism. On the evening of the last day it was unanimously decided with great enthusiasm to create

a new permanent organisation 'The League against Imperialism, Colonial Oppression and for National Independence', officially based in Paris. The Executive Committee of this new League is permanently constituted of Nehru (India), Lian (China), Senghor (Black Races), Mohammad Hatta (Indonesie), Lansbury (England), Münzenberg (Germany), Dr. Marteau (Belgium) and Edo Fimmen (The Netherlands) with Barbusse, Baldwin and Bridgeman as possible deputies.

We see that in the Executive Committee place was made for an Indonesian representative. This can only afford us much pleasure. For in this is inferred the recognition that our native country is an important factor in the world community.

What the development of this new League will be, the future will tell.

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, 1927.

8 Indonesia and her independence problem

Lecture given during the international holiday course organised by the International League of Women for Peace and Freedom during August and September 1927 in Gland

Le but de l'humanité, ce n'est pas le repos dans une ignorance résignée; c'est la guerre implacable contre le faux, la lutte contre le mal. Ernest Renan

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear Comrades!

It is with real pleasure that I address you today. First and foremost I would thank most cordially the International League of Women for Peace and Freedom who have invited me to speak here on the political problem of my country. It is a very good idea of yours to devote your International Holiday Course this year to examining some aspects of the problem of relations between the white and coloured races. Nowadays these relations are purely colonial relations which have become more and more dangerous for universal peace. It is right to say, with Mr. Du Bois, the American Negro leader, that the problem of our era is the problem of the coloured races. For throughout their countries one can see how they are stirring to shake off the imperialist yoke of the white races.

I am going to speak to you about Indonesia. Generally you know it as the 'Dutch East Indies'. It is equally known as the Sunda Archipelago. But Indonesia is the preferred name which we Indonesian nationalists give to our country. The name 'Indonesia' for us is a sacred symbol of a country which in the future will be free. It is to achieve this ideal that today we are struggling against Dutch imperialism and sacrificing our personal interests.

Indonesia is a group of islands extending over the middle of the Indian Ocean, between 95° and 142° longitude from Greenwich and 6° and 11° latitude north and south. It has a population of 50 million souls, and a culture which has been glorious since ancient times. In order to get an accurate idea of the extent of this archipelago, let us in thought juxtapose the map of Indonesia with that of

Europe; it will stretch from the northern extremity of Scotland and from Portugal to the Caucasus. Being situated between two continents, Asia and Australia, and between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific, extending over an eighth of the equatorial circumference of the globe, this insular region serves as a natural port of call between all the countries which surround it. By virtue of its geographical and economic position, Indonesia is destined to play an important part in the world. But this importance is not due merely to its geographic and economic position, it is due above all to its tremendous wealth of natural products. Indonesia is a producing and exporting country par excellence. Her exports amount to some two thousand millions of florins per annum. And every year she supplies the world community with a surplus of on an average 500 million florins. It is this wealth which has been the cause of Indonesia's subjugation by the Dutch State.

Despite all this you hardly ever hear of Indonesia. The organs of your public opinion have given you scarcely any information about the events which are taking place in the archipelago. Probably there are many amongst you who believe Indonesia to be inhabited by a people with an inferior civilisation or perhaps even by savages. This is not so. These 50 million Indonesians possess a proud history and constitute a nation with a long and ancient culture. The Indonesian national has its own civilisation born of the Hindu and Islamic cultures.[1] In the most distant past the Indonesians earned the reputation of being one of the most energetic of nations; with their frail sailing boats they undertook the most daring explorations, from the shores of the China Sea to Madagscar and the east coast of Africa, and from the Persian Gulf to Easter Island in the Pacific. Before the arrival of Western traders, practically the whole of navigation and maritime trading in the Far East was in the hands of the Indonesians.

Like ancient Rome, the Indonesian people during its history knew glorious times, when the Indonesian talent and character manifested themselves, when even the ideal of the Indonesians of unifying under one rule all the territories inhabited by the Indonesian race including the Malayan peninsula and the Philippines, was achieved. This was the period of the famous Empire of Madjapahit which from the 14th to the 15th century played a very brilliant rôle in the political life of all eastern Asia. Nowadays, in some parts of Indonesia one still finds a number of relics of this glorious past.[2]

But now Indonesia is known only as a colony to be exploited; as a country which produces sugar, tea, coffee, tobacco, rubber etc. . . . And the suffering and grief of the 50 million colonised inhabitants who are oppressed and terrorised is not known. Because precise information is lacking, it is supposed that in this colony belonging to one of Europe's smallest nationals there reign tranquillity and peace; it is believed that the Indonesian nation has no ideals and is not struggling for its independence. But is it possible that a people with a great past should be capable of being false to itself? No. He who is not a stranger to Indonesia knows that there too there is 'something rotten'. Why in this fact unknown by the outside world? It is because the Dutch ruler takes care to hide from public opinion what is going on in the colony.

No doubt you were surprised by the news of the rising at the end of 1926 in the western part of Java and in the west of Sumatra at the beginning of the year. And yet this event should not have seemed so unexpected to European eyes. The colonial government had known for a long time that something was brewing in the mass of the Indonesian nation and that one could not foresee where this movement would end. Despite this, the government believed and still believes that it can survive by the use of brute force. It is very remarkable – and very characteristic of the conservatism of the colonial régime – that the despotic government did not want to know that resistance had become a general thing. As a fire broods under the ashes, hatred for the white tyrant is ripening in the hearts of the Indonesian masses. And at a given moment it explodes into a violent conflagration. The same hatred for the foreign oppressor shows itself even more clearly at Atjeh, the westernmost part of Indonesia, where the population, faithful to its tradition, tirelessly attacks the ruler. And despite the bloody repression of the recent uprising, the spirit of rebellion still reigns in Java, though up till now the soldiers have been the trusty instrument of the colonial régime. Latterly it has repeatedly been found that even the army, which consists for the most part of Indonesians, no longer appears invulnerable to the onslaught of the 'germ of nationalism'. The mighty colonial edifice has become more and more shaky.

In the life of an oppressed people there are always periods of resistance to the tyrant; the recent rebellion in Java and Sumatra is only one of numerous explosions of the people's anger, which will not be appeased until the return to independence. The ruling

power may act in the most tyrannical manner, violently repress an uprising, they will never be able to create unbroken tranquillity and lasting peace in the community they have subjugated by violence. In colonial society the period of dumb resignation lasts only as long as the conquered people sees no way of opposing the regime of force. Armed peace is the essential nature of colonial relationships.

A French author, E. Fallot, defines colonisation in the most alluring terms: 'the action exercised by a civilised nation on a country with a civilisation inferior to its own, with the aim of gradually transforming it by developing its natural resources and improving the material and moral conditions of existence.'[3]

This definition has a fine sound, but reality gives it the lie. For nowhere has colonisation begun from the philanthropic desire to improve less civilised peoples. The essential aim of colonisation has been and always will be to make certain countries masters of the natural resources of other countries. And colonial history knows few examples where conquest was not accompanied by the oppression and exploitation of the indigenous population. Nevertheless this inhuman action is always claimed to be carried out in the name of civilisation, whereas for the conquering power civilisation consists solely in exploiting the colony as intensively as possible. Civilisation is confused with material progress, which is intended to serve the needs of the mother country. The people who exploit a colony do not ask themselves if their system is immoral or not, but whether it is giving the maximum profit.

This is how colonisation ought to be defined: 'the use of the rapacity and greed of the materially stronger nations in order to satisfy their economic and commercial interests at the expense of the weaker nations'. Colonial relationships, far from taking place by mutual agreement to the benefit of two countries, are in reality the seizure by force by an exploiting country of a population, whose forces and talents it harnesses. These relationships therefore imply opposing interests and forces. Whereas the conqueror wishes at all costs to retain his colony, the subjugated people, with an indomitable will, is working to recover its independence. It is only by force that the ruling power can maintain these forced relationships. All efforts at legal justification are thus absurd, the colonial law being always domination imposed from outside. If one recognises as a judicial standard the general consciousness of justice rooted in the masses,[4] the colonial regime stands legally condemned by this

alone. For one cannot imagine that a self-respecting nation wishes to ratify the violence and injustice it is being made to undergo. The people, more than the individual, have a sense of honour and justice. Galbaud expressed this idea by saying that 'order re-established by the foreigner was called slavery by all peoples'. It is thus right to say with Stirner that law in colonial society is nothing other than the force of authority.

Dutch colonisation in Indonesia does not differ from other colonisations. It has already lasted for three centuries, during which time it has been an uninterrupted sequence of tyranny and oppression.

When, after the decline of the glorious Empire of Madjapahit, Islam reached Indonesia, there was a new epoch of lively trade and great prosperity. But this period did not last long. At the beginning of the 16th century white foreigners appeared on the scene. First the Portuguese and the Spaniards, coming in search of spices. These products which had long constituted the principal source of wealth and prosperity of Indonesia became the cause of her enslavement. It was the East Indies Company coming after the Portuguese and Spaniards who put down the foundations of the Dutch colonial domination in the Far East. It was created in 1602 with the monopoly of trade in the countries to the east of the Cape of Good Hope, as far as the Magellan Straits.

Its original aim of peaceful trading soon changed to a warlike undertaking. With its policy of 'divide and rule' it soon succeeded in subjugating a large part of Indonesia. We see by this that the white man, wherever he is established, tramples the rights of man underfoot.

Nevertheless for a long time Atjeh preserved a proud and redoubtable power. Even during the time of its greatest military power, the East Indies Company did not dare to attack Atjeh direct. Although it ardently desired the ruin of this kingdom, it used only diplomatic means in its dealings with it.[5] On the other hand, the rest of Indonesia was subjugated by violence. The desire to get hold of the spices inspired the Company with a hateful policy of cunning and force. In order to maintain its monopoly, it cynically determined to lay waste fertile regions. Already in the first part of the 17th century in the whole of the isle of Banda there remained no descendant of the former inhabitants, formerly happy and prosperous.[6] The native population down to the last man had been put to the sword, or deported to the wilderness where death soon

released them from their sad fate. The growing of cloves and nutmeg was restricted to a few islands appointed by the Company itself. The ownership of the nutmeg groves was given to friends of the servants of the Company who also grew cloves with the help of slaves imported from Timor, Celebes and other islands. The Moluccas, once so rich, as a result of this vandalism have now become a very poor colony, the poorest in Indonesia.

Thanks to its monopoly and its enforced crops, the Company succeeded in achieving profits of hundreds of millions of florins. Its profit was more than 100% per annum, whilst the price of its shares rose to 1080% of their nominal value. Enriched by these millions from their colony, the Dutch were able to increases their trade and navigation in Europe considerably and to enlarge their cities.[7]

But wealth acquired through the energy of another is the greatest cause of decadence and demoralisation. The unbounded greed which gradually became general among the civil servants, from top to bottom of the hierarchy, brought moral corruption in its wake. Its own agents gnawed the body of the 'illustrious' Company like parasites. It was this corruption which caused the Company's downfall.

When in 1800 the Dutch State had become the heir of the East Indies Company, faithful to the tradition of its race it maintained the old forced crop-growing. A single motive inspired its colonial policy: to keep the colony in the service of the mother country. The crisis in the Dutch Treasury was the immediate cause of this policy. Millions of florins had to come from Indonesia to ensure the prosperity of the mother country, and for this purpose the old forced crop-growing had to be continued.[8] Instead of a private individual, it was the government itself which was going to assist in this inhuman and immoral action. King William I was happy to find in the person of Van den Bosch the man he needed to accomplish this task. The latter set out in 1830 as governor-general of Indonesia and imposed the famous system whose pitiless application was deadly in its effects on the population. Not only did the government make use of the labour of the native population for the sugar, indigo and coffee plantations, but it exploited this labour to such a point that the population was rapidly decimated. From one year to the next the Indonesians found themselves obliged to work almost without wages for the government, so that they no longer had the time necessary to cultivate their own rice-fields. In addition crushing taxes weighed them down. The civil servants who displayed

the greatest skill in exploiting the population were rewarded with money and advantageous positions.

The native population, no longer being able to dispose freely of their own labour and the fruits of their labour under this regime, found themselves in effect in the state of slavery. Eight hundred thousand families, forming a total of some 4 million souls, were compelled to work at crop-growing, in such a way that half of the island of Java was transformed into a colony of slaves. The baleful consequences of this immoral and inhuman regime soon made themselves felt. In the vicinity of Semarang alone more than 100,000 men, women and children died of hunger from October 1849 to March 1850; they were no longer able to cultivate their rice-fields'.[9]

Whilst in this country so favoured by nature tens of thousands of men were dying of hunger and poverty, millions of florins poured every year out of Indonesia into Holland. From 1840 to 1875, the total amount of this 'balance of receipts' was 781 millions – an enormous sum for those times – of which 7/9 came from growing coffee. Faced with this abnormal poverty of the Indonesian people the Dutch realised the immoral and criminal nature of this system of forced crop-growing. But it was another cause which made it possible to abandon the system: the favourable state of the Treasury. Thanks to the surplus coming annually from Indonesia, the financial situation of Holland had long since become stabilised. Otherwise the system of forced crops would doubtless have been maintained. A Dutch economist, Mr. Van den Berg, a former President of the Bank of Java, estimated in 1885 that the total surplus amounted to 844 million florins, whilst Mr. Domela Nieuwenhuis, at that time a Deputy, valued it at 850 million florins. Mr. Van Deventer wrote in 1899 in a Dutch periodical *De Gids* that this sum was Holland's 'debt of honour' to Indonesia. If one adds today the interest on this debt at 5% per annum, it already amounts to more than five and a half thousand million florins. But Holland has never had any intention of paying this debt of honour.

In 1870 there was passed a draft bill thanks to the minister De Waal which put an end to this frightful system of forced crops. However, there could as yet be no talk of an attempt at regenerating the Indonesian people economically and socially. For this law tended to facilitate initiative by private individuals for exploiting the economic wealth of the colony. For the Indonesian people, morally and physically weakened as they were, the abandonment of the policy of forced crop-growing only meant a change of ex-

ploiter. Instead of endeavouring to improve the economic situation of the population, the government delivered them into the hands of the big capitalist undertakings.

The swift invasion of a large amount of capital broke down social bonds without replacing them by new organisations; it bared weaknesses but gave no new strength, thus exerting a demoralising influence.[10] The new regime saw more profits flowing to Holland than during the whole of the two preceding periods. In the short period from 1915 to 1920 the export surplus from Indonesia rose to 3 thousands 300 million florins, of which more than two thousand million represent the nett profit of the war, whilst one thousand 250 millions came from sugar.[11] While these thousands of millions of florins went out of Indonesia the country itself was going through a crisis and the native population was a prey to famine. If the capital thus extracted had been allotted in time, Indonesia would not have been overcome as she is by the worst calamities.

Let us now look at what Holland gave to the Indonesian population in exchange for the wealth taken from the soil, cultivated by the ill-paid labour of the natives. The Dutch try to have it thought abroad that their colonisation brings happiness to Indonesia. In reality Dutch domination over Indonesia has had the result of proletarising Indonesian society. The national structure is denatured by the domination of a large amount of capital and of the colonial government, its natural support. Here in Europe the tremendous oppression of capitalism on the disarmed working masses is specially tempered by social legislation, a product of capitalism itself, though imposed by the labour movement. The interests of the weaker sections of the population are in part safeguarded by the public authority. Things are different in an exploited colony like Indonesia where one of the two races is exploited and oppressed by the other race. There exists no social legislation to protect the workers against the exploitation by powerful heads of capitalist undertakings. The workers, at the mercy of the employers' whim, have only starvation wages, averaging 50 cents (± 1 Swiss franc) per day, which is scarcely sufficient to feed the worker and his family. Thus he soon loses his health.

Now let us compare with these starvation wages a list of dividends received by the Dutch shareholders of some firms in Indonesia in 1926:

Suikerfabriek Tjoekir	50 %
Ned. Indische Cultuur Mij.	35 %
Deli-Batavia Mij.	52 %
Cult. Mij. Kali Tello	45 %
Cult. Mij. Kali Kabar	45 %
Deli Maatschappij	26 %
Tabaks Mij. Arendsburg	60 %
Sumatra Rubber Cult. Mij.	37 %
Mijnbouw Mij. Simau	50 %
Senembah Mij.	35 %
Cult. Mij. Ngredjo	60 %
Cult. Mij. Goalpara	46 %
Cult. Mij. Medarie	15 %
Petroleum Mij. Moeara Enim	$27^1/_3$%
Cult. Mij. Soerowinangoen	40 %
Cult. Mij. Tjeper	63 %
Handels-Vereenniging Amsterdam	30 %
Dortsche Cult. Mij.	15 %

No doubt there are some firms who distribute a dividend of less than 15%; but in the majority of cases the dividends are enormous. But here we have a sharp contrast between the economic situation of the coloniser and that of the colonised, a contrast created by the colonial system, where the population does not have complete freedom to organise itself politically and economically. The prohibition of strikes removes from the workers any possibility of improving their wretched lot. But on the other hand the colonial Government is always ready to protect the interests of the capitalist class of its own race. In other regions than Java, for example in the province of East Sumatra (Deli) where the population is sparse, it is the heads of firms and not the workers who enjoy government protection, so that they are always able to reap rich dividends each year. The population, much less dense than that of Java, is not yet reduced to such poverty that it must sell its labour to the first comer. According to the economic law of supply and demand the employers would have to pay a very high wage to obtain a sufficient supply of labour. That is to say that they would have to be satisfied with less profit. This is the natural mechanism in a free trade society. But things are different in Indonesia, where the people have not the right to dispose of themselves. So that the employers won't have to pay high wages to the coolies on the plantations the

colonial government, the natural support of the capitalists, has introduced the system of the so-called *penal sanction*, which in practice equates to slavery. A labour contract between workers and employers, that is to say a *civil* contract, has *penal* sanctions attached to it. In a free state each man must be free to break or fulfil the undertakings of a work contract, with the consequences laid down by civil law. In a provision of civil law there must not be penal clauses, since a threat of punishment is only admissible when the public interest is at stake. But this is not the case with the system of penal sanction in Deli, which guarantees the private interests of the heads of European firms.

And what barbarous method is not applied to recruit workers to the plantations? The heads of firms, with the assistance of their accomplices in Java, take advantage of the poverty of the Javanese to recruit labour on the basis of payments on account. To lure them on they dazzle the coolies with prospects of a marvellous future. They are given advances; by giving them some cash at once they hope to get them in the right frame of mind. Gambling, opium, prostitutes, even constraint and violence – none of these means is considered too bad if it can procure the labour which is so much sought after. When the coolie is already bound for several years, they have got him for good, for he is forced, in a very astute way, to sign a new contract.[12] During re-engagements on the plantations, the same infamous methods are practised to get hold of the workers again, when they are scarcely freed from their disguised slavery. Thus they continually try to play on the weaknesses, on the bad instincts, on the naive qualities and lack of education of the Javanese, who for some entertainment and cash in hand can be led into signing a contract which in reality they reject.

The wretched coolie, once having signed the contract, is in effect delivered over to the contractor, as it were bound hand and foot. A prison sentence of three months and twelve days and a fine of 25 florins threaten the worker who commits any kind of infringement of the work contract (articles 8, 12 and 13 of the law gazette of 1880, no. 133). Deliberate infringements of the working contract are judged to be the following: a) desertion; b) continued refusal to work. Moreover, the freedom of the worker to leave the plantation during his leisure time is retricted, as he needs a special permit from the employer to do so.

The workers who, having left the plantation by necessity or with a permit, do not return at the right time are brought back to the

plantation by the employer's staff, though of course officially by the police. Such measures of constraint and such penal clauses turn the coolie into a veritable slave.

Contract labour implies absolute obedience on the part of the coolie, and this has the very serious consequence that the employer, whilst demanding that the coolie be completely at his disposal, tends to neglect the factors which might prevent him from doing the work agreed on. Furthermore, the coolie is at the employer's whim; article 9, par. 3 of the said law of 1880 lays down that the workers is obliged to work regularly, strictly to obey the orders given by the employer so as to achieve the contractual undertakings, and in short to submit himself to the contract in all his conduct. Thus the coolie has a great number of obligations to fulfil and the employer may always give him all kinds of orders. Therefore he easily forgets one of these; when every small negligence is reported, the coolie has to justify all these faults every day to a judge. This threat of punishment depresses him morally.

Now I ask you: is there an essential difference between the system of *penal sanctions* and *slavery* which is condemned by modern civilisations as a relic of barbarism? I say there is not!

It is always said that slavery has been completely abolished for more than half a century. But in Indonesia, despite all the international agreements, this same slavery still exists under a modern form, maintained in the name of Christianity by one of the nations of Western Europe which claims to be a civilised state.

The peasants who are the ground landlords in Java, who rent their land to the sugar industries are no better treated. They earn much less by hiring out their land, sometimes hardly the half of what they would gain by cultivating them themselves. By cunning and indirect constraint they are pushed into ceding their land. The colonial government is thus responsible for the profound destitution into which the Indonesian masses have sunk. But this is not all. Despite the increasing poverty of the population, taxes, which were already crushing, have been continually increased, especially under the regime of Governor-General Fock (1921-1926). In a well-documented talk which he gave at the so-called *Volksraad* in 1924, the Regent R.A.A.A. Djajadiningrat drew the attention of the government to the miserable economic and social condition of the population of his province, in Western Java. There are people, he said, who only earn 65 florins a year – mark, *a year*, but who must pay nevertheless a tax of 26 florins – that is to say 40% out

of such a tiny income![13] But the same wretched economic condition is to be found almost everywhere in Java.

Each time the population is impoverished to the point where discontent breaks out everywhere, the government, instead of seeking means to combat the poverty, can think of nothing better to do than appoint a commission of inquiry into the regression of prosperity of the people. These inquiries have always found that the process of empoverishment has increased in scope. But the government has done nothing further to improve the economic situation of the population.

Not only does the colonial government care little about the economic interests of the population, but public health, one of the principal factors of national prosperity, is shamefully neglected.

The miserable conditions of the inhabitants of the *kampongs* (native quarters) defy all description. A large part of the people are forced by their extreme poverty to live in hovels where they fall prey to all kinds of diseases. In the very centre of Batavia, despite the existence of a corporation, there are districts consisting of nothing but dilapidated dwellings which remain flooded for three days after rain. No doubt I should bore you if I listed all this wretchedness in detail. All I need add is that colonial bureaucracy has not an accurate notion of the misery and needs of the people.

Education is carried on under conditions just as sad and impoverished as in private dwellings. Despite European domination for more than three hundred years, in Indonesia there are still about 93% illiterates. The old Indonesian system of education has been destroyed without being adequately replaced. Before the Dutch invasion, most Indonesians knew at least how to read and write the national characters. The Company stopped this form of instruction. Up till 1858 not a halfpenny was provided for educating the natives in the colonial budget, although the colony was pouring millions of florins into the Dutch Treasury every year.[14] Later on, when the exploitation of the natural resources required a cheap yet educated labour force, they took care to give practical instruction. But the colonial government devotes only some 16 million florins to the children, that is to say for a population of 50 million inhabitants, about 32 cents per person. For the education of Europeans, on the other hand, about 15 millions are reserved, that is to say about 75 florins per person for a population of 200,000 Europeans. Throughout the whole of Indonesia are only 16,158 native primary schools with 1,222,459 pupils, that is to say 15.2% of all Indonesian child-

ren between 5 and 15 years old. Every year there are thousands of children who do not enter school because there are no places. Nor should one forget that in many cases popular education is financed by the village itself and not by the government.

This is all that the 'apostle of civilisation' has done for his colonial subjects and that is all the so-called intellectual profit which we are getting from the so-called 'good' colonisation. But there is worse than this. During recent years the colonial government is showing a tendency to make economies, and thus is prejudicing the most important interests of the people, such as education, public health and agriculture. The total expenditure on education (including expenditure on Dutch Schools and the colleges etc.) in 1921 was 39.4 million florins; in 1925 it was reduced to 33.1 millions. Expenditure on public health in 1921 was 21.7 million florins; in 1924 12.7 millions. Expenditure on agriculture amounted in 1921 to 5.1 million florins; in 1925 it was reduced to 3.9 millions. On the other hand, credits for the army and navy have increased. Taxes have increased incessantly and are becoming more and more intolerable. Truly the Indonesian people have reason to be happy! Recently the colonial government found once again from a commission that there is a grave drop in the people's well-being!

That in broad outline is the result of Dutch colonial administration in Indonesia over more than 300 years! I have given you a historical resumé of these matters so that it will clearly emerge that since the beginnings of the Company up to our own times the general character of the colonial regime of Holland has not been altered. Thus, the same demoralisation and the same corruption already found in the time of the Company were repeated again recently, under the regime of Governor-General Fock (1921-1926), in the Dutch civil servants, from top to bottom of the hierarchy. The misappropriations by civil servants in the collection of taxes are still the order of the day. It is not very long ago that an Indonesian civil servant, demang Datuq Kayo, confirmed this latter fact in the *Volksraad*, the Indonesian pseudo-parliament.

As regards the political education of the people, in what measure has this been achieved? One may state that the Dutch colonial system does not in any way envisage the emancipation of the colonised people. The only principle in force is that of holding on to the colony at all costs, because it is 'the cork on which Holland's prosperity floats'. And consequently Holland will never declare in favour of independence.

By what means does the overlord maintain his authority? If we enter into the spirit of colonial policy, we see that only violence can uphold this authority. The Dutch colonial system continually mocks at the idea of democracy. Up till 1854 Indonesia was governed by brute force alone, a regime in accordance with the policy of exploitation by the State. Later, when this policy was shown to be inadequate and control by foreign powers was feared, a new era began, where authority sought its support in the law. This was the period of the so-called government regulations, that is to say the organic law for the administration of colonies. But this was only a camouflage; the new colonial system did not comprise modern legislation. It was not the expression of the general will of the people, but only of the will of the ruler, to which the Indonesian people could oppose nothing. In Indonesia, the laws are therefore only instruments of oppression, making it possible to stifle at birth any attempts at resistance to the tyranny of authority. At the beginning of this period of so-called legality, the population naturally had no right of participation in the administration of the country. The government regulation even forbade (art. 111) all meetings and associations with a political tendency, a clause which was maintained until 1915. As has been expounded by a Dutch professor Mr. Kleintjes,[15] this prohibition stemmed from the principle that the authority is the sole judge in the matter of public interest and that the intervention of the people cannot be permitted in this sector. Thus the situation was not normal by any standards.

Censorship of the Press is one of the chief means of stifling any protest against the authority's wishes, for the latter is aware that a protest by the press could draw the attention of public opinion, and in so doing, harm Dutch prestige throughout the world. Justice itself, in Indonesia, is not exempt from partiality. Psychologically this is easy to understand, since those to be judged are a subjugated people of a different race and more or less hostile to the custodian of power. It follows that under the colonial regime there can only exist a racial justice, which does not serve the law but the policy of the authority. New proof is added of this every day.

But governmental whim goes further. Where the judiciary power cannot intervene, the administrative power takes over. The Governor-General possesses the 'exorbitant right' to deport to uninhabited regions any person that he deems 'dangerous for the public order', even if that person has committed no crime and consequently the judge has no reason to condemn him. You, comrades, who

doubtless attribute to the word Justice a very exalted meaning, will certainly share my view that it is difficult to imagine greater arbitrary power in an organised society.

But the Indonesian people, deceived and martyrised, have taken a grip on themselves and by instinct they are returning to the right road. They are vigorously demanding their rights. Despite the prohibition of meetings, a national movement has developed since 1908. The idea of a free country was clearly launched by the 'Insulinde' association. And since then the desire for an independent Indonesia remains alive. The rapid growth of the national movement can no longer be arrested. Neither the arrest of several leaders nor the expulsion of three eminent heads of the 'Insulinde' party – who had protested against the celebration, in oppressed Indonesia, of the centenary of the independence of the Netherlands – nothing has been able to interrupt the progress of the national awakening.

Any national movement in its beginnings seeks to collaborate with the ruler. It was the same with the Indonesian national movement. First it demanded for the people the participation in the country's administration by means of a parliament. Toward the end of the war revolution was threatening everywhere in Europe. In Holland too, a socialist revolution was to be feared, it seemed, and the colonial government deemed it wise to cede to certain demands, the most moderate demands of the Indonesian nationalists. Governor-General Van Limburg Stirum formulated in the name of the Government the famous promise of November 1918, which contained a programme of political reforms. The Indonesian people really believed in the good faith of the ruler and thought that the modern gospel of Wilson, the right of peoples to dispose of their own destinies, was going to be realised. But the facts showed the naivety of such a hope under the present political regime, which was too entrenched in its traditions to seek to carry out the new principles in the name of which it claimed to act. Thus, following this solemn promise, a new and particularly reactionary colonial regime was applied. To the liberal Governor-General Van Limburg Stirum there succeeded Mr. Fock, the symbol of despotism. His government, which lasted from 1921 to 1926, was accompanied by a veritable terror.

It was then that government and people, already separated by the difference in race, entered into conflict. Faced with an oppressor intent on preserving his power, the people rose, inspired by the idea

of the liberation of their country, an aspiration which no force can destroy. Awakened from their credulity, this nation displays an absolute mistrust vis-à-vis the ruling power. The policy of 'non-cooperation' is beginning. From now on the Indonesians will try to achieve their ends by their own methods. But the government, which sees in this attitude a threat to its prestige, combats it with terrorism, instead of satisfying the people's desires. And this terrorism is pushing the national movement further and further to wards revolution.

Under a show of maintaining order, the action of the sugar workers' union is paralysed by suspending the right to meet in the largest political and industrial centres. The railwaymen's unions, threatening to come out on strike to support the sugar workers, the chief leader of the railwaymen was arrested, by virtue of the article in the criminal code punishing incitement to strike. Some weeks afterwards, the said leader was banished to an uninhabited place; but the governor-general allowed him to leave Indonesia.

After this the government legislators got to work and enacted the famous article 161 bis of the criminal code which prohibits any strike, purely and simply. Thus the population is left with no possibility of organising itself politically and economically. The terrorist measures of the government are equivalent in practice to a complete suppression of the right to meet. No doubt in theory this right is suspended only for certain territories, but even in those areas where meetings are not officially prohibited, those who meet are arbitrarily dispersed by the police, who do not hesitate to make use of their weapons in the event of any protests or resistance.

Private meetings are not safe either, government spies penetrate these, waiting for their prey like vultures. Under these circumstances the national movement is reduced, as can be understood, to clandestine activity, which is less dangerous for its partisans. The government is not unaware of this. Bombs and assassinations of those in league with authority are the order of the day.

But it is the government itself, by its own despotic regime, which is responsible for all this! It maintains itself artifically with the help of a truly monstrous secret service. Behind the scenes in the colony a veritable terror rampages: everywhere one meets well-paid informers, aggressive police officers and unscrupulous agents provocateurs. Many innocent leaders are their victims. Several of them have been exiled without their guilt having been proved, to New Guinea, where malaria and death await them. In the month

of May 1926 the colonial government brought out its latest finds: two new articles in the criminal code which render any activity impossible, and the text of which I give you below, by way of curiosity:

Article 153 bis: He who intentionally by word, written word or image, even indirectly, under condition or cryptically, encourages or militates in favour of a disturbance of public order or of the overthrowing of the authority established in the Netherlands or the Dutch Indies or who attacks the said authority shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 6 years or a maximum fine of 300 florins.

Article 153 ter: He who with a view to giving publicity to same or of increasing publicity of same distributes, exposes or publicly displays any written matter or an image, by any means whatsoever, indirectly, under condition or cryptically, has encouraged or militated in favour of a disturbance of public order or of the overthrowing of the authority established in the Netherlands or in the Dutch Indies or has attacked the said authority, will be punished by a maximum imprisonment of 5 years or a maximum fine of 300 florins.

Anyone who is not a stranger to Indonesia knows the flexibility of the articles of the criminal code; one can always apply them as one wants!

Under these conditions, is it surprising that the people's dissatisfaction continues to grow and that clandestine activity is carried on in ever more intensive ways? Sooner than was expected, the explosion occurred, manifesting itself in the last uprising in the western part of Java and the west of Sumatra. This uprising threatened to spread to the whole of Indonesia. The lack of discipline of some party heads enabled the colonial government to contain the uprising. In an article by the Indonesia correspondent of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*[16] one read that the secret organisation of the Indonesians had been set up in an extremely detailed and careful manner, hence the very understandable consternation of Dutch circles. It goes without saying that this insurrection was suppressed by force in the most rigorous manner. An unarmed and defenceless crowd was fired on which perhaps had not even participated in the movement. That the government should condemn to the severest penalties and to death the leading insurgents who wished to overthrow it is in accordance with what it calls its right. But the despotic action which it exercises cannot be excused. For in fact innocent people, particularly leaders imprisoned long before

the uprising for simple press offences were singled out for deportation to a wild region in the centre of New Guinea, deprived of all contact with the outside world. The governor-general himself, in his speech at the session of the opening of the Volksraad during the present month of May, declared that it was not impossible that there might be some innocent people amongst those deported. Despite this declaration the despotism of the government goes on.

So there, my friends, is the sad result of Holland's colonial administration. During these 300 years we have watched the continual oppression of a peaceful people, by a nation which is still celebrating its own war of independence against Spain in the 16th and 17th centuries.

The simple fact that the Javanese, known as the gentlest people in the world, should have been capable of such a revolt, proves how abominable is the Dutch colonial regime. And it is high time the attention of the world was drawn to the horrors continually committed in our country. Little Holland, which claims to be a colonial power of the first order, had brought nothing but misery to her millions of subjects. We do not wish to deny for a single moment that modern undertakings have been created in our country, and that modern methods of production have been adopted. But these are European-owned undertakings from which they alone profit. The government has never seriously pushed the natives to improve their methods of production as does the government of any free state. Thus, we Indonesian nationalists understand very well that in order to increase our prosperity we must set to work ourselves.

Little Holland, which commits so many injustices against a nation of 50 million souls, on which she imposes a hated yoke, claims on top of everything that Indonesia is not yet ready for autonomy. This affirmation is a lie. It is not Indonesia which is not ready for independence. It is Holland which is incapable of educating a people much greater than its own and possessing a civilisation and culture which are more ancient. Holland has neither the power nor the will to achieve such an end. We must declare that the Indonesian people possesses qualities which enable it to govern itself. Since the most ancient times the political institutions of the Indonesians have been based on the principle of 'self-government' down to the organisation of the smallest villages.[17] Thus the Indonesian people knows what democracy means; it already supplies 80% of the colonial civil servants. Therefore we only have to replace a small number of top civil servants and we should be re-

leased! We have enough intellectual talent amongst us. The senior Dutch authorities themselves admit that Indonesian civil servants, from the regent down to the meanest officials possess excellent administrative qualities. It is also the fault of the colonial system if sometimes these circles are lacking in morality because it does not allow them to express their opinions freely. But this is only the logical consequence of the colonial system of education which strives to form slave mentalities. The situation will change as soon as the Indonesians have the right to dispose of their own destinies. The thesis of 'premature self-government' is no longer tenable. If it were true that Indonesia is not yet ready for independence, how is it that Abyssinia, the Hejaz, the Yemen, Siam etc. which are intellectually and democratically less advanced than Indonesia, can be declared independent states, capable of governing themselves? It is quite clear that it is the tremendous wealth of Indonesia which has conferred on it the label of 'premature for self-government'. The reality is that Holland does not wish to give up her colony, since her prosperity depends on it.

It is out of pure selfishness that she maintains this hated regime. Can one expect that in order to satisfy this selfishness we should renounce our right to national independence? As for us Indonesian nationalists, we would rather see Indonesia sink to the bottom of the sea than to have it subjected by any other nation whatsoever to permanent slavery.

The latest revolts in Java and Sumatra may have failed, the colonial government may imprison, condemn to death and exile hundreds of leaders to New Guinea, in marshy regions where savages and headhunters roam – the revolutionary spirit of the Indonesian people remains immortal. The Indonesian people is no longer, as once it was, a sentimental people dreaming of a happy life in the other world or in future incarnation, but thanks to its sufferings it has become a people which thinks realistically and is endowed with goodwill and a great hope. Despite political difficulties, created by recent events, a new and purely nationalist party will be formed, based on the mass of the people. I am convinced that our nationalist movement must conquer, because it is founded on a very lofty ideal, because the young leaders who are in charge of it now 'disregard their own personal interests, they have a noble soul and are completely disinterested'.

1. For the history of Indonesian civilisation, see: Fruin-Mees, *Geschiedenis van Java*, Weltevreden 1922, 2 vols.
Prof. N. J. Krom, *Hindo-Javaanse geschiedenis*, The Hague 1926.
Gabriel Ferrand, *L'empire sumatranais de Crivijaja.*
2. See N. J. Krom, *Het oude Java en zijn kunst*, Haarlem, 1923.
3. E. Fallot: *L'avenir colonial de la France*, Paris.
4. See: Prof. Krabbe, *Die Lehre der Rechtssouveränität*, Groningen 1906, p. 171 and p. 175; See also his: *Die Moderne Staatsidee*, p. 50.
5. Van Soest, *Geschiedenis van het cultuurstelsel*, Rotterdam, 1869, pp. 10 & 11.
6. Van Soest, pp. 30 and 31.
7. Van Soest, p. 35.
8. On the subject of forced crop-growing, see: N. G. Pierson, *Cultuurstelsel*; by the same author: *Koloniale politiek*; J. E. Stokvis, *Van Wingewest naar Zelfbestuur*; Van Soest, *Geschiedenis van het cultuurstelsel*, 3 vols.; Clive Day, *The policy and administration of the Dutch in Java.*
9. H. H. van Kol, *De vrijmaking van Nederlandsch-Indië*, p. 11.
10. Dr. J. H. Boeke, *Auto-activiteit naast autonomie*, The Hague 1922, p. 54.
11. E. Helfferich, *Die Wirtschaft Niederländisch-Indiens im Weltkriege und heute*, Hamburg, 1921, p. 21.
12. See: W. Middendorp, *De poenale sanctie*, Haarlem 1924; J. L. Lefèbre, *De poenale sanctie*, 1918.
13. Account of the session of 1924 of the National Council, p. 138.
14. J. E. Stokvis, *Van wingewest naar zelfbestuur*, p. 81.
15. *Staatsinstellingen van Nederlandsch-Indië*, Vol. I, 4th ed., p. 135.
16. 28th December 1926.
17. On Indonesian democracy, see: J. B. Haga, *Indonesische en Indische democratie.*

9 The Anti-Colonial Congress in Brussels in the light of world history

1

When the American Negro leader Du Bois, on the threshold of this century, gave his vision of world events in warning words to the Westerner saying that the twentieth century would be the century of the coloured peoples, everyone was prepared to regard him as a foolish dreamer who was talking nonsense. Little could one then guess that already in the next few decades symptoms would arise pointing in the direction of Du Bois' prophecy.

The white race was still riding roughshod in complete power and its supremacy over the coloured peoples was unshakeably firm. The period of modern imperialism had only just recently begun, but already the results were amazing. In less than fifteen years the land-hungry states of Europe were able, under the slogan of spreading Western culture, to get almost the whole of Africa and Asia under their rule. Where was the Westerner whose heart did not then beat with pride at the thought that this 'work of pacification' could take place in such a short period of time? And who would not see in this the establishment of Western superiority and the unassailability of white supremacy?

But being dazzled by one's own pomp and magnificence has always been the herald of one's own downfall. Du Bois already knew that! However, the white man had learned nothing from world history. Thus did the age of technical culture, as people were so delighted to call the nineteenth century, have the result that the weaker peoples of coloured race fell into the claws of Western imperialism. Countries and territories that had never been colonised before were, without any account being taken even of their populations, divided into spheres of influence, spheres of interest and financial protectorates. Surrounded by cannon, machine guns and rifles, the great masters at the green conference table were able

arbitrarily to decide the fate of a large part of mankind which did not seek high culture in the science of munitions manufacture. And so we see how it happened that the world of coloured peoples was simply converted into colonies, semi-colonies and protectorates. It is significant that all these expeditions of conquest, in which peaceful people who dared to resist the intruder were violently subdued or crushed, are said to have been carried out in the name of Christian culture.

How ironical it is that not one Pope, not one head of any Protestant sect, ever protested against that slogan, as if it had been Christ's wish that weaker peoples should be slaughtered in a brutal manner with the equipment of modern warfare. It is no surprise to us that, where the teaching of Christ materialises in the hands of Westerners, expeditions to plunder enjoy the blessings of the Christian churches, whether Protestant of Catholic, as if they were crusades against the 'unchristian barbarians'. But the modern crusade in this imperialist period is no crusade in a religious sense. It has no other goal than the removal of economic resources from foreign countries whose peoples are not materialistic by nature.

In order to mask the illegality of these plundering expeditions and the use of brute force in them, a modern gospel is preached to the effect that the rich natural resources of every country must be put to the services of the world community and that they must not be allowed to remain unexploited due to the incapacity of those who live there.

Yes, indeed! and the coloured peoples can pay for it. Not only are they deprived of their economic resources but at the same time they are subjected to a system of modern slavery.

We can see how the imperialist states, in order to satisfy their material desires, act in a way that mocks the concepts of morals and humanity. Human rights are quite unscrupulously trodden underfoot, as if they were only obstacles in this world of 'modern' culture. Slavery has been abolished, but it is coming back in modern form.

The coloured man is allowed a barely human existence. Not only is he despised and humiliated: he is not even known.

That is roughly how matters stood at the threshold of the twentieth century!

The increasing pride of the Westerner and his belief in the unassailability of his power are to be explained mainly by the fact that the West had an immeasurable start in the technological

field over the East, while the coloured peoples, on the other hand, still slept their sleep of lethargy.

But a shock went through the edifice of Western imperialism when the Land of the Rising Sun defeated the Russian colossus in 1905. This brought about a revision of ideas both in the white as well as the coloured world. The herald of a new day had come! A turning point in the history of the world! The booming of the cannons of Chushima proclaimed to the world that the divine right of the white man in Asia had ceased to be. And as if awakened from their spell, the Asians hurried to the race of nations to secure for themselves what is called a place in the sun. In the whole world of oppressed peoples the national awakening began. Japan's victory, apart from leading to that country's elevation to a Great Power, found its repercussion in the revolution of the Young Turks of 1908, which certainly had a more far-reaching purpose than simply the overthrow of the despotic regime of Abdul Hamid, as many a historian pictures it for us.

The fundamental causes of this revolution were nothing other than the yearning of Turkey for an equivalent position with other nations in the European community and for the abolition of the obsolete and – for the country – humiliating treaties such as the capitulations.

In the excellent Memoirs of Jemal Pasha (Jemal Pasha, *Erinnerungen eines türkischen Staatsmannes*), one of the principal figures in the Young Turks party, 'Unity and Progress', one can read with all clarity how much the Young Turks were intent upon modernising their country at a very fast pace and thereby releasing it from the grip of the great imperialist powers. The participation of Turkey in the World War on the side of the Central Powers, after France had refused to guarantee the right of this country to exist continuously threatened as it was by Russia, had its root causes therein. But the modernising work of the Young Turks had a setback when the Ottoman Empire fell to the Central Powers. The thread was however taken up a few years later by new leaders.

Japan's victory had a second repercussion in the Chinese Revolution of 1911, the work of the great Asian Sun Yat Sen, which led to the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty which was replaced by the Chinese Republic. Only a few were then aware that it was not the republic alone that was the object of Sun Yat Sen's work. That object could be nothing but the complete equality of China with the European powers. This land of ancient culture had had to submit

for too long to the humiliation of those whom the Chinese called 'the red barbarians' from the West. But even this modernising process had to be interrupted for almost a decade as a result of the mischief-making and the divide-and-rule policy of the great imperialist powers, who felt threatened, and the treachery of self-seeking feudal lords and some generals, for whom personal interest weighed heavier than the interest and the future of their own country.

In the purely colonial countries, too, the white man experienced the echo of the general awakening. In a minimum period of time the national movements took on tremendous proportions, an event which had never been dreamed of before. In India, in Indonesia, in Egypt, in the Philippines, indeed nearly everywhere in the coloured world the process of national consciousness and rebirth made itself felt. No power was any longer in a condition to oppose these national aspirations.

In the colonising countries people finally came round to acknowledge that this general national revival was a sign of the times. The belief in the unassailability of the supremacy of the white race began to seem shaky even to the Westerner himself. New signs appeared in the political sky. First softly, but then ever more sharply, conflicts arose between white and coloured. Conflicts that will soon become *power* conflicts, as soons as the coloured man becomes aware of his own strength and ability.

Although the white man was still in a position of absolute power in fact, the rising tide of the coloured races caused him no little worry. Sooner or later a collision would have to happen between the two race groups. People began to be aware of this. How should these race conflicts be resolved? From whom and from where should the solution come? These were the thorny problems which confronted people when the World War broke out in 1914, with its fatal consequences for the whole of mankind and for the white race in particular.

Those four years of dreadful human slaughter, of untold waste of property and life, of passion and sacrifice, of grief and effort, was nothing but the natural consequence of the imperialist race of the Western great powers.

Millions of young and flowering lives that could have been of inestimable service to economic production, colossal amounts of raw materials, semi-manufactured goods and millions of other capital goods were sacrified in this terrible way on the altar of

selfishness and uncontrollable acquisitiveness. Thus the world of coloured people was able to see with its own eyes how cruel and horrible Western civilization can be. It discovered how Western culture, based on technology and economic principles brings untold misery and horror upon mankind, the after-effects of which are still felt by the succeeding generations. Is it any wonder that the few grains of respect that the coloured peoples still had to spare for the white man in 1914 were now completely lost, to make way for contempt?

But there is more! Because of the pressure of the circumstances of war and also because of the ghost of revolution, which since the overthrow of the Czarist regime haunted the whole world, the colonial powers felt obliged to make fine promises to their coloured subjects. As a reward for their loyal stand during the difficult years of world conflagration, they would get a new constitution for their country, which would mean a step forward in the direction of ultimate freedom.

When shortly afterwards Wilson came along with his modern gospel of the right of peoples to self-determination, the subjects indeed believed that this sweet-sounding message would also apply to them. Then, at last, after centuries of servitude and resignation, the star of hope returned to shine in the heaven of the coloured world. People were really convinced that the national freedom they so ardently longed for would become a fact, if not immediately, at least in the foreseeable future. People thought in their ingenuousness that they could see how the beautiful promises of their rulers and the unforgettable words of Wilson formed a harmonious whole.

But what a desillusionment this trick policy was to the childish trust of the oppressed peoples! Instead of the keeping of a promise once so solemnly made, what the world saw was the bloody drama of Amritsar and the Dyeristic equivalent in Egypt, the Garut affair in Indonesia, not to speak of the new colonial partition, of England's attempts at new expeditions in Afghanistan and Persia and the private partition of the last remains of Turkey's 'independence' in the form of spheres of influence among the 'big' three, England, France and Italy on the basis of the 'tripartite agreement' of the 14th of November 1920. Even China, which had fought on the side of the Entente in the World War, could scarcely count on being treated decently. As opposed to the great booty which the imperialist European powers demanded for themselves as the fruits of their victory, the Celestial Kingdom, though in truth fellow-victors

could not get more than it already had: the pitiable plight of a semi-colony. Far from being treated better, this poor country had into the bargain to live more than ever under imperialist threats.

But the claws of world imperialism stretch even farther out than just to Africa and Asia. The Central and South American States now also became threatened by them, in particular from the side of the United States of America. The modern Yankees are very clever at exploiting the Monroe Doctrine in the interests of their own economic expansion drive.

First published in *Recht en Vrijheid*, Year 1, no. 16, 7th April 1928.

2

Thus after the World War we see new trends of world imperialism appear, which are even more dangerous than those of the previous periods. Whilst before the war the great European powers were able to keep each other under control through the system of the balance of power, we now get a situation in which a smaller group of great powers have dominion of the fate of the greater part of humanity.

But the new period of 'High Imperialism' necessarily entails new forces and new conflicts. Whoever does not shut his eyes to the course of history will doubtless not have remained unaware of the changed mentality in the world of coloured and oppressed races. As a result of the embitteredness, to which the negation of promises by the oppressor gave rise, there awoke in them a feeling of self-confidence. From then on people wanted to seek their salvation in their own strength and ability. There is mistrust of the white dominator, which makes the tension between the ruler and the ruled more dangerous!

That is how matters stood at the beginning of the new period. How naive are those who believe that the new time is one of which the character can most clearly be described as 'the victory of law over brute force', since in practice the opposite has continually been the case for us. Nor is the so highly praised Institution of the League of Nations, which was to be the so-called guardian of world peace, nor the institute of international conferences under the aegis of this League, where they have the economic and disarmament conferences and such like, which mostly come to nothing, in a con-

dition to keep the trends of the new imperialism in check one little bit.[1] How many times has it not become apparent that the League of Nations, as it now is, is not much more than an instrument in the hands of the Great Powers.

How violent the conflict of interests now is after the World War can be understood when one remembers that the new world situation, which has come about through the demise of the old balance of power, has given birth to new power antitheses which are more dangerous than ever! No longer do we see nations ranged against each other because their interests are in conflict, but races now stand against races. The coloured man against the white man. The oppressed against the oppressor. In the face of advancing western imperialism the defensive eastern nationalism stands firm. Thus we already see symptoms occurring in the second decade of this century which seem to give closer confirmation of the thesis of Du Bois that the greatest problem which the 20th century has to solve is . . . the race problem.

Is it not significant for our time that the first bloody collision between the two opposing forces since the beginning of the high imperialist period took place precisely at a point on the globe where the East stops and the West begins? In the mountain country of Anatolia of the Turkish homeland! Ever since the old days these highlands have served as a gateway of invasion, now from the flood of western nations threatening to crush the East, then the other way round from the movement of eastern nations in the direction of the West. Whenever a new turning point comes about in world history in which there is an important change in the relations between East and West, then the decisive battle in these highlands always seems to be the harbinger of things to come. This time it is no different!

The greatest post-war imperialist wave springs from England, rolling in an easterly direction. While the artery of the British World Empire lies in the basin of the Indus and the Euphrates it is understandable that England could never feel safe as long as both the routes to it, by sea through the Suez Canal and the Red Sea and by land over Turkish Anatolia and Mesopotamia, had not fallen under her control. An important strategic position is thus also the possession of the Arabian peninsula. From this it is immediately evident why England has for years with unabated diligence made every possible effort to get this Arabian country under its protectorateship. Which has not succeeded up to now! When this peninsu-

la was still under the domination of the Ottoman Empire England left no means untried to make the Arabian potentates disloyal to the Sublime Porte.[2] Along both routes to Asia England always met with Turkey as the obstacle. A powerful Turkey always means danger to England's safety. Thus the reason for England's struggle continually to weaken this country both internally and externally! Many an attack on the ruling governments also occurred during the Imperial period just as under the auspices of the English representative to the Porte. When Turkey came out of the world war completely beaten perfidious Albion considered the time had come to put the Dardanelles and Asia Minor under her control. Thus it is in the course of British Imperialism to make another Gibraltar out of Constantinople and another Egypt out of Anatolia. Thus the Peace Treaty of Sèvres of 1920, brought about mainly due to England's heavy pressure on her allies. A peace treaty that in practice boiled down to the conversion of Turkey into a colony! It would be a catastrophe for the whole of Asia if the English imperial tide had been able to engulf this trusty country, the advance post of Asia's defence. It is part of the immortal fame of Mustafa Kemal that he was able to turn the threatening imperialist tide. Out of the wreck of the old Ottoman Empire he was able to shape a new powerful nation from which so much power now comes that the world is amazed. In the greatest emergency into which the country had fallen and in which everyone gasped for breath, this Anatolian hero was able to win over the trust of his people and to fill them with courage. In Ankara he founded the citadel of Turkish nationalism, where the spirit of self-confidence ruled and where trust in one's own strength and ability dominated. Only over this irreducible citadel could English imperialism beat its safe passage to India. In order to smash the powerful resistance of organised Turkish nationalism England needed help. From Greece, her shield-bearer! With her diplomatic instinct Albion skilfully knew how to take advantage of Greece's dream of expansion. An exceptionally well-trained Greek army of some hundred thousand souls, well equipped with modern English cannon, machine-guns, tanks and aircraft, was despatched to Anatolia to overthrow this Turkish homeland. Certainly the English taxpayers had to finance this dangerous and very costly adventure. But the already heavily taxed Greek farmers were even more weighed down by the unbearable pressure of the costs of the war and increasing interest on the national debt. In addition one must not forget the great sacrifice of some ten thousand

young and flowering lives to which Greece had to resign itself so as to satisfy the desires of England and Venizelos and his clique.

The second big offensive of the Greek army, with the object of taking Ankara, met strong resistance on the Sakaria river from the Kemalist fighting forces. Of this bloody clash Toynbee says:[3] 'The contest was really the meeting of East and West in a contest between a westernized Power and the new Turkey of supremacy'. After violent and bloody slaughter lasting more than three weeks the Greek army had to withdraw to its former positions, the Eski-Sheir-Afioon Karahissar line, beaten and demoralised.

Writers who show a penetrating insight into the rhythmic course of world history and who know how, with the power of their instinct, to draw conclusions from historical comparisons attach great symbolic value to the battle on the Sakaria river. Thus, for example, Clair Price says:[4]

'The Turkish victory on the banks of the Sakaria radically changed the political complexion of the Near and Middle East. For two hundred years, the West has been breaking down the old Ottoman Empire, but on the Sakaria River it encountered the Turk himself, and, when it touched, the tide of history turned. History will one day find in this obscure engagement on the Sakaria one of the decisive battles of our era'. And that is indeed the case. Barely a full year afterwards Mustafa Kemal totally destroyed the Greek fighting forces in Asia Minor and later made a triumphant entry into Constantinople as he had done into Smyrna. The indirect consequence of the Turkish army's triumphant victory was the defeat of English imperialist politics in the Levant. The victory first won with arms by the Turkish nationalists was less than a year later crowned by a victory in the diplomatic field. The once so detested Turk, for whom the European knew no other qualification than 'Asian barbarian', and who had to be banned from the European community, now came triumphantly back into Europe. And more powerful than ever he plants his feet down on both banks of the Bosphorus. And not only is this reborn Asian now tolerated in Europe but a high price is even put on his presence at the specific European gathering in Geneva, whilst his absence is also deplored. This is another proof that in this world of imperialist domination culture is not the yardstick, but that people have to show their teeth in order to be counted in!

The acceptance of the Turkish victory, says René Grousset,[5] was the acknowledgement of the greatest setback that England has ever

suffered since her loss of the American colonies: 'it was the loss of the East'. England has indeed taken an almighty knock. Lloyd George's loud bellowings for help that shook all Albion and her Dominions when the victorious Turkish army threatened to press through over Chanak into Europe certainly proves how weak the British Empire was internally.

With the Turkish victory there has come a turning point in world history. Not only because by removing its capital to the interior of Anatolia Turkey gives signs of wishing to return to being an Asian nation, but also and more especially because the victory of the Turks over English imperialism brought about a new awakening in the whole of the East. The roar of the cannon of Afioon-Karahissar was a new call to the Asian to be prepared for the decisive battle against the intruding white man. The Asian recovered his self-confidence and began to bestir himself everywhere. On the Ankaran horizon he once again saw the flicker of the star of hope, which lights up the whole of the Asian world. In every Asian intellect Ankara lives as the Mecca of modern nationalism, which is distinguished by reliance on one's own power and ability.

First published in *Recht en Vrijheid*, Year 1, no. 18, 12th May 1928.

3

In the same way as a dozen years ago, the Turkish example was closely followed, this time by the awakening China, the young China of Sun Yat Sen. Never discouraged by the many reverses suffered, this great patriot again picked up the thread of his work as soon as the opportunity to do so presented itself. Evidently he, too, learned the lesson from Kemal's strategy that if one wishes to have a new nation born out of the wreckage of the old it is not enough to overthrow the central authority and then to govern with the paraphenalia of the obsolete regime. He rightly saw that a new and powerful nation can only be built on the rubble of the old regime, steeped in modern principles. Like Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Sun Yat Sen realised that he had to start by forming a State within the State. And thus did he shape the China of Canton, the embodiment of the national Chinese will on which, up until recently, the hope of all revived China was founded. But alas, the premature death of the great leader brought a change into the once so hopeful

situation. With the passing of Sun Yat Sen the fatal hour tolled for the Chinese revolution. While people were gaining ground daily at the expense of the prestige of western imperialism in the world and its position in China, and while the victorious nationalist army advanced on Peking, people began to sow dissension in their own ranks, instead of reinforcing unity, and stirred up feuds between each other with uncontrollable passion, so that the national bastion that had been so laboriously brought about collapsed. The process of national reconstruction thereby took a tremendous blow to the advantage of the imperialist powers in China. A dark curtain has now fallen on the once so hopeful Chinese Revolution. The prospects for the current Chinese chaos are sombre. But must we therefore despair of China's future? However unhopeful the situation now is, however sombre the scene may be, we are nonetheless convinced that Chinese nationalism will one day get new exponents, inspired by the high ideal that beckons and calls. We are convinced that China will one day get national leaders who are not self-seeking, who know the deep meaning of the battle fought with one's own power and ability, as Mustafa Kemal of Turkey so brilliantly fought it.

If we want to judge the Chinese Revolution, which now appears in a state of chaos, then we must above all not lose sight of the amount of time the French Revolution of 1789 needed in order to become completely consolidated, and yet it still gave birth to the present day Western democracy. How long, too, does not the Russian Revolution need to reform the social order on the foundations of its teaching? It has already celebrated its ten year anniversary, but its purpose is far from achieved. Let us keep all this in mind and we will realise that the immense Celestial Empire (China) will need plenty of time to consolidate itself completely in the principles of the new society. In this connection let us above all not forget that China's freedom movement has a dual aspect, which makes the situation complicated. On the one hand a nationalist struggle is being waged against world imperialism, which holds China a prisoner within obsolete treaty clauses, and on the other hand the struggle has the quality of a process of emancipation to release the Chinese people from an oppressive and suffocating feudal system. And China will not be able to opt out of the pressing demands of the law of evolution of human society.

What has been happening in the past few years in China is rich in lessons for the national movements in other countries, with re-

gard to an appreciation of the tactics to be used, of what must be done and what must not be done.

If we take a look at other Asian countries we see that there, too, Western imperialism is meeting with the powerful resistance of a self-confident defensive nationalism. England's imperialist expeditions to Persia and Afghanistan have been too costly. Instead of getting these countries completely under her influence, England achieved the opposite.

New national heroes have arisen to hasten the process of national re-birth.

And what do we see in the truly colonised countries? Not a different picture. The modern national movement breathes the spirit of self-confidence. Everywhere the demolition work of active, yet by nature defensive, nationalism is in full swing. And our century will yet bear witness to the collapse of the edifice of world imperialism in these countries.

In the 'black' world, too, things are no different. Here also Western imperialism is meeting with opposition which must not be underestimated. The Negro race has awakened, after centuries of lethargic sleep. And the Arabic part of Africa is busy organising itself thoroughly. We have already seen how bravely the Riffs can stand up against the two great imperialist states. Even though their leader, Abdul Karim, has surrendered to the French, the fire kindled by him in the Riff country is far from having been extinguished. And did he not himself forecast in his message to Latin America that the fire that was blazing in the Riff will one day spread to the countries on the Southern and Eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea? And the hour of freedom will then toll – as he said – for Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli, where the people are already preparing for the struggle that will bring victory. Abdul Karim is already dreaming of the rebirth of the Arabian race which has given mankind three glorious civilizations. Is this not Utopia? Time will tell! Let us not underestimate also the growing national movement in Egypt and the increasing hatred of the Egyptians for the English, and likewise what has been happening in the past few years in the kingdom of king Ibn Saud. The Pan-Islamic movement, thought to be dead, is in fact surviving with Mecca as the centre. Modern Pan-Islamism is not the same as its namesake of Abdul Hamid, which only served to salvage the prestige of the Ottoman Empire of that time, but is a real organization of the Muslims of the whole world with a clearly perceptible political foundation: the emanci-

pation of the Mohammedan people from the grip of world imperialism.

If we now analyse the forces which give rise to the racial problem in our century we can trace them back to a fundamental struggle between Western imperialism and the defensive nationalism of the coloured races. Only a victory of the passive can give humanity a world order in which universal peace reigns. How these mutually conflicting forces will further develop is not hard to conjecture. We already see trends which point to the balance moving slowly but surely over to the side of the oppressed and coloured peoples. History seems to be proving Du Bois right. This the imperialist powers themselves know full well. Hence their clamour on all sides to warn European states that they must, if you please, stop fighting among themselves, and that they must pay attention to the East where a process is developing which Stoddard calls 'the rising tide of colour'. Although the whites, supported by their lead in technology and the ownership of huge quantities of the materials of murder, are still in a fortified position, we already see their prophets making propaganda for the 'united front' of European nations, ostensibly to resist the rising tide of the coloured races. But how? This can only be done by the brute suppression of the aspirations emerging among these peoples. So far this is also the only way in which the Western imperialist powers maintain their dominating position opposite the weak and freedom-seeking oppressed peoples. But this can only lead to the sharpening of the conflicts which must of necessity end in a mighty drama of nations of such a scope and intensity that we cannot, in this day and age, begin to understand. Already now we can see how the yawning chasm between the white race and the coloured race is getting deeper and wider day by day. Idealists of an humanitarian persuasion still try to resolve this conflict of races by a route which they in their peculiar way call peaceful and humanitarian. According to this teaching, for this it is necessary for the different nations to be mindful of the highest purpose of society. And that is brotherhood and love of one's neighbour. And the first step that must be taken is the reconciliation of peoples with each other and not the aggravation of conflicts. All propaganda for the promotion of universal peace is regarded as a great virtue, whilst the elimination of the hatred, which lives on in the hearts of many nations, is also a part of it. With their slogans of 'the brotherhood of nations' and 'love thy neighbour', of 'Down with war!' and 'Down with hate!', these

humanitarian preachers go to towns and villages, over land and sea, to make converts to this ideal which is undoubtedly very praiseworthy in itself. But the odd thing about it is that these preachers of the humanitarian doctrine look for their areas of work mainly within the colonised countries, where the population is oppressed and tyrannised, where it sees the rape of its rights. Such slogans are fine and beautiful, but they do not have the power to bring a solution to the racial conflict because they are not based on an understanding and on a penetrating study of the nature of the racial problem. The reality is crude and hard and will not bc resolved by empty slogans. Universal freedom and the brotherhood of nations are good and fine things, but for these what is required first of all is the disappearance of racial conflicts, the disappearance of the domination of one nation by another. For brotherhood can scarcely exist between master and slave. And the truth is that the elimination of racial conflicts and of colonial domination is not a process that can take a peaceful course, much as we would have liked it to. Never has history given us a precedent for the ruler withdrawing of his own free will from his position of power over other peoples. And therefore, however fatal and cruel the consequences of racial conflicts may be for humanity, we can only accept them as a product of the present world system. China now gives us an example of this sombre truth. The inevitable consequences of world imperialism cannot be averted. Thus, only if Western imperialism, which has brought so much sorrow and misery to the whole world, is to be overcome, will Mankind be able to hope for a new world order in which there can be talk of universal peace and of brotherhood between different nations. If these things are to be regarded as a precious gift for humanity and at the same time as expressions of a high culture, then it is up to civilization to ban world imperialism, which stands in the way of their realization, from the face of the earth.

To what extent this reckoning will have to take place is naturally difficult to foretell. It depends on the development, on the forces in the future. Certainly the coloured nations must be fully alive to the fact that they must avoid any rash act, so as not to weaken their own position. In the struggle against imperialism the coloured nations must take care in the first years to build up a reliable organization. This must be brought about with such a degree of perfection that the elimination of Western imperialism can take place with a minimum number of victims. The fact that people are busy working in this direction can be seen everywhere. Nationally and internationally

people are setting about building and extending the organization. Thus people came spontaneously upon the idea of shaping a broader organization, from which would flow the world unity of oppressed peoples and races. The setting up of the *League against Imperialism, against Colonial Oppression and for National Independence*, on the 15th February 1927 in Brussels, fits very well into this.

Since this League includes within it at the same time both Western workers' organizations and fighters against imperialism, thus fighters of all shades, it is of great importance, very briefly, to take account of the awakening and the increasing consciousness of the proletariat and of the emergence of other anti-imperialist movements in the West.

Recht en Vrijheid, Year 1, nos 16, 18 and 20, 1928.

1. As regards the stillborn *Geneva Protocol* of 1924 we will simply keep silent. It only demonstrates the inability of the League of Nations to give any guarantee of the maintenance of the world peace, so earnestly longed for by humanity.
2. Some light is shed on this for us by the article by L., a competent English author, in *Foreign Affairs*, January 1927, entitled: 'Downing Street and Arab Potentates'. C.f. *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, morning paper of 17 March 1927: 'Arabië'.
3. Toybee and Kirkwood, *Turkey*, page 100.
4. Clair Price, *The Rebirth of Turkey*, page 188.
5. René Grousset, *The Awakening of Asia*, page 36.

10 A retrospective account of the Second Congress of the League against Imperialism and for National Independence held in Frankfurt

It is difficult to give a full account of the second Congress of the League, which took place from the 20th-27th July this year in Frankfurt, in the limited space available in our magazine. It is even possible to mention the main points of the reports and the ensuing exchange of thought, as we would hope to do. A report of this kind is better given in the members meeting of our association.

What we have in mind with the following account is merely to give an impression of the Frankfurt Congress and to draw conclusions as to what might be the future of the League.

The suppressed, coloured peoples, who saw in the League an organ which one day would develop into the International of suppressed nations, will be disappointed by the sharp contrast which exists between the Brussels Anti-Colonial Congress of 1927 and the Frankfurt Congress. Whereas in Brussels one was inspired by the ideal of close co-operation to achieve the freedom of suppressed nations, and it was there that the desire for unity of white, yellow, brown and black peoples had triumhed, in Frankfurt they only succeeded in demonstrating their internal divisions to the great joy of the imperial rulers. Never before in the League has the difference between communists and non-communists come to the foreground so sharply as in this congress. A tidal wave of fanaticism came from the side of the strongly represented communists, which threatened to destroy everything which did not fully reflect communist feeling. Even moderate and flexible elements amongst them, like Münzenberg and others, who before everything else wish to see the League as an international platform for *all* anti-imperialists of any political inclination – because the League can only continue existing when it is independent – even they could not stem the wave of fanaticism of their party members. Especially James Maxton, elected chairman of the League, and leader of

the I.L.P. proved a target for sharp attacks. Justifiably the *Frankfurter Nachrichten* spoke of 'Sturm über Maxton'. The revolutionary nationalists of the suppressed nations as a whole were being denounced as 'traitors' – a general magic formula by which the complicated position of the national movement in the East was being measured. Against which Perhimpunan Indonesia and the Indian National Congress defended themselves energetically. One need not wonder that our delegation at this congress was being observed with suspicion. The fact that P.I. drew attention to its responsibility to the Indonesian National Movement left it open to barely disguised remarks like: 'Oh, ils sont des nationalistes avec beaucoup de responsabilité'. Curiously enough many appreciated hearing from our representatives' side what P.I. thought about the Congress and how they envisaged the future of the League.

At this Congress differences developed to such an extent that a severe crisis occurred on the third day and many a participant thought that the League would soon collapse and not survive till the end of the congress. Fierce fighting was going on behind the scenes in an effort to diminish the differences and save the existence of the League. In the end an atmosphere of reconciliation and harmony prevailed, thanks to the speeches of Maxton and Münzenberg both made in loyal terms. Both speakers were enthusiastically cheered; the League's chances seemed improved. But this was more appearance than reality. The favourable impressions on this last evening would have been wiped away instantaneously had it not been for Mohammad Hatta, chairman of this important sitting, who prevented Negro communist Ford and Chinese communist Lu Ki who were preparing a new attack on Maxton, from speaking.

At the moment – and no-one will deny this – the League finds itself in a difficult crisis. A reconciliation of opposing views did not materialise in Frankfurt. Only a status quo was reached without a favourable prospect of harmonious cooperation. The differences are too great, the *Prinzipienreiterei* has gone too far. Outside the League the *Fraktionskämpfe* take on ever increasing proportions which could affect the League any moment. The communists regard it as their holy duty to fight the leftwing socialists and nobody would deny them this right. But to transfer this bitter fight to the League with the ensuing danger that the League will collapse, is irresponsible.

When one considers in all honesty what happened in Frankfurt one cannot but fear for the League's future. A very noteworthy article was written by Lou de Visser in *De Tribune* of 18th August: 'That in the near future in the League too a purification-process will take place'. It is not difficult to deduce in which direction this purification process will develop. In Frankfurt we could already see how the hardcore communists were setting about conquering the League completely for Moscow. This managed to convey the impression to outsiders that the League is merely a tool of the Soviet State instead of being first and foremost for the service of the suppressed nations. Resolutions were proposed whereby the suppressed nations were called upon to defend Soviet Russia against potential attacks of imperialist powers.

It cannot be denied that each suppressed subjugated nation – be it republican or monarchist, possibly even anti-communist, has an interest in the existence of Soviet Russia, which is a continuous threat to Western Europe and its civilization. As long as this threat exists the pressure of imperialism in colonial countries will be eased. But however much interest the suppressed nations have in the existence of Soviet-Russia, it would be foolish to suppose that they would be able and ready to defend it. They themselves are still suffering from terrible suppression and unable to banish the imperialist rulers out of their country, they need all their powers to safeguard their existence – how could they feel themselves obliged to come to someone else's aid?

It is clear that the resolutions proposed and pushed through by the communists in Frankfurt have little meaning and are of little practical value. It was also evident that the representatives of suppressed nations in Frankfurt showed great indifference towards such decisions. For them their appearance at the congress was firstly propaganda for their country and secondly to keep in touch with each other and to keep informed of each other's sufferings, and needs, of each other's struggles and tactics and of each other's experiences and mistakes.

The occurrences in Frankfurt are not without importance for our future orientation. The quarrelling at this second congress was a dramatic milestone in the history of suffering of the once so hopeful League against Imperialism and for National Independence. It also indicates how difficult it is to maintain and build up an organisation with so many diverse political elements as are respresented here: Eastern nationalists, communists, leftwing socialists,

anarchists, anti-militarists and bourgeois radical pacifists. Not without reason the *Frankfurter Zeitung* of the 29th July reports: 'Wenn es nicht zum Bruche kam, so war diese ganze Debatte doch ein Beweis dafür, dass es bei den stärksten Faktoren der Bewegung an wirklichem inneren Zusammenhang fehlt'. This inner cohesion can only be attained when parties who support the League are prepared to show the maximum of endurance.

Even though one condemns such tactics, it is not surprising that the hardcore communists have tried to use the League as a useful tool of the comintern in the interest of the Russian State at this Frankfurt Congress. Yes, why should the communists not do this? Their state, being in the position of an island in the centre of a capitalist lake has to cope with uninterrupted foreign imperialist attacks, and feels continuously threatened by economic boycotts. When the Soviets found that they could improve their isolated position by using the League of suppressed nations – why should they fail to do so? Whether the suppressed nations will lend themselves to it is another question. History of the last decade has clearly indicated that the suppressed nations are prepared to use Moscow when necessary, but in return are not prepared to be used by Moscow. We can see this clearly for example in the politics of Mustafa Kemal during the Turkish war of Independence, which was fought to drive the Greeks, armed and financed by England, out of his Home Country. At the time he was prepared to accept all Moscow's material and moral support, but no Bolshevik soldier or propagandist was allowed to set foot on Turkish soil.

The attitude, which the representatives of the suppressed nations in the League adopt towards Soviet Russia is unlikely to be different from Mustafa Kemal's in his struggle. They are prepared to work on an equal footing with all Western anti-imperialist forces insofar as is beneficial to their purposes, but never in a subordinate position or relationship. As far as the character of their battle is concerned, this is well indicated by the forementioned *Frankfurter Zeitung* of the 29th July: 'Bei dem Unabhängigkeitskampf der Kolonialvölker, der sich in den verschiedenen Ländern in verschiedenen Formen abspielt, stehen rein nationalistische Gedanken noch sehr im Vordergrund. Der Klassenkampf bringt da eine Spaltung hervor, die den grossen Zielen kaum nützlich ist'. This immediately explains why the vast majority of coloureds behaved so passively towards the white *Fraktionskämpfe.* At the most they showed their disapproval.

After all that happened in Frankfurt, is one justified in asking: Where is the League going? The near future will give an answer to this question. It can be easily predicted that the hardcore elements amongst the communists will continue their purification process. This process practically means the exclusion of all white, non-communist elements from the League, so that in the end this organisation will consist only of communists and Eastern nationalists. The problem is then whether the Eastern Nationalists will be content with this situation and whether they regard such a League as a promotion of their national aims. This is a problem that the hardcore ought to sincerely look into.

As far as Perhimpunan Indonesia is concerned, its point of view cannot be misunderstood by anyone. As long as a year ago they openly hinted that they do not regard it desirable in tactical and practical terms to form a League just with the communists. And we feel we can assume that most organisations of Eastern nationalists are of the same opinion as far as the League is concerned. A 'purification process' in the League would mean in practical terms the disbandment of this organisation. What interest does this serve?

In the event of the League against Imperialism and for National Independence collapsing in the crisis in which it now finds itself, a new League will arise from its ruins and only the suppressed nations of coloured race could be its supporters. Because, if the present League collapses under its own weight, it will make it more difficult to establish a similar union of white and coloured peoples. What kind of outcome can one expect as regards the fate of the League in the near future? At the moment we can only say: wait and see!

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, 1929.

11 'Indonesia free'

PREFACE

Owing to a variety of circumstances this plea can only appear in print a lot later than I had wished. In the first place this is because I gave the only copy I had to the Law Court and only got it back on the 22nd of March. Since then I have been fully occupied with other matters so that I had little time to give this statement the form it now has.

My statement shows signs of over-hasty work. This is because I only had a little time to put it together. In addition, I had very little material and literature at my disposal in prison. May this serve as an excuse for those who would have expected more of me. There is now much to be said in favour of altering the style and knocking the statement into shape here and there. But I wanted to put before my readers what I handed in to the Law Court. Merely for the clarification of the argument have I added a few quotations, which I wished to include in the original text but which were not available to me at the time. Where this happens I point it out in a footnote.

For the convenience of the reader I am dividing my statement unlike the original, into chapters and paragraphs without, however, altering anything in the text. This is all in the way of changes that I have made to the original text.

I hope this statement will contribute to a greater knowledge of the action of Perhimpoenan Indonesia and to a greater interest in this country concerning the Indonesian question, which promises to become a very burning one in the near future.

1. INTRODUCTION

Your Lordships, Chairman and Judges!

When the editors of *Indonesia Merdeka* wrote a prefatory note in 1924 to the New Year, the following remark came from their pens:

'*Indonesia Merdeka* has become the voice of Indonesian Student Youth, a voice which is perhaps not yet listened to by those in power, but which will one day be heard. Not with impunity shall the voice be ignored, because behind that voice lies the firm will to continue to regain rights and, sooner or later, to set up and establish in the world an *Indonesia Merdeka* (Free Indonesia).'

Little did they expect that that voice would find an echo so soon, particularly in the ruling circles. Still less could they suppose that that voice would so quickly be put on trial. I now stand here before you, My Lords Chairman and Judges, to give an account of the purpose and striving of Perhimpoenan Indonesia and to justify that purpose and striving from *my* point of view.

The defence, legal and political, of our case against the accusation which has ultimately been made against us I will understandably leave to the members of our counsel, Mr. J. E. W. Duys, Mr. Tj. Mobach and Miss E. P. A. Weber. I will therefore confine myself to explaining the purpose and aspirations of Perhimpoenan Indonesia and to analysing the various political and psychological factors which have a bearing on the direction which this society has taken. I will as far as possible support my argument with official declarations of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, as they have been expressed in *Indonesia Merdeka* so that it cannot be said that I have not faithfully reflected the dominating spirit of my organization.

Mr. Chairman, I have just mentioned psychological factors that have an influence on the direction of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. If its actions are to be understood, then account must be taken of the existence of the colonial problem, of the colonial relationship and, last but not least, of colonial society.

2. INDONESIAN YOUTH AND POLITICS

My Lord Chairman! I would first of all put up a question for discussion which is related to the general psychological factor: why Indonesian student youth takes an *active* part in politics. Because in the Western countries this is regarded as something abnormal, as a morbid symptom. Some people claim that the cause of it lies in Western influences. But in general we do *not* see that phenomenon in Western countries. Therefore it is not the inevitable result of Western culture. A similar phenomenon did occur, however, in

Russia during the Czarist regime, in old Austria-Hungary (among the Czech students) and in Italy when it groaned under the yoke of foreign rule, and this coincidence is not fortuitous.

In Europe the best part of academic youth shows a warm interest in the great social questions, not in an active way, however, but only in the *abstract*. In the *West* intellectual youth is *preparing* itself in the universities for political and social activities. In *Indonesia* it *takes part* in it already while it is still at school. The youth organizations such as Young-Java, Young Sumatran League, Young Minahassa, Young Ambon, Young Islamic League, Young Indonesia etc. all saw the light of day within the walls of – and this is true – the secondary schools.

Why should this be? To understand this properly one must realise that youth does not educate itself, but it *is educated* in those circumstances in which it grows up and in that society in which it is placed. In a colonial society youth very quickly learns the hard truth; it sees with its own eyes the distress and the misery of the oppressed mass, and how it was initially resigned to its fate and how for decades it passively bore the torments of a system doomed to death. It feels and understands the anguish and the misery of its people. It is because of this that in the programme of practically all youth organizations in Indonesia the aim set out is: *the social uplift of the people*. It is youth, with all its sincerity, that is completely aware of the enslavement by a foreign oligarchy; on it rests most heavily the deep humiliation of being unfree. Both the organs of public opinion of the white rulers as well as their arrogant behaviour towards the colonised people are a constant reminder of it. That is why the son of a chained people is occupied with thoughts from his earliest years which a free Westerner of the same age would never think of. Whilst the Dutch, French or English student can devote himself in a completely carefree way to the silly-sweet pleasures of youth, the Indonesian youngster has to prepare himself for a task which makes other demands. Indonesian youth will find no way already marked out for it, it does not slot into a job that is already in hand, but it must start building up from the ground in difficult circumstances, in the midst of struggle and bustle, of bitterness and hate. The hard struggle for independence, which it sees looming before it, puts it in a serious mood and perhaps makes it old for its age.

But there is another factor, my Lord Chairman, which is the reason why Indonesian youth becomes active in politics so early. In

this country it is often asked with amazement: why do intellectual Indonesian youths make life difficult for themselves by cracking their brains on all kinds of colonial-political questions instead of enjoying the beauty of their years of youth? Why are they dissatisfied after all? Do they not, after all, come in the main from the upper officials classes or the well-to-do of native society?

My Lord Chairman, the answer to that, it seems to me, is contained in the question itself! Because precisely in the higher official circles of the colonial society it is so often found that insincerity is a basic principle of life. The nature of the colonial system of administration compels Indonesian civil servants either to keep silent, or to lie, or to hedge when talking on colonial-political questions. They are constantly reminded that it does not befit them to make any kind of criticism of the colonial administration, of which they are themselves a part. So a youth, in these so-called leading circles of Indonesian society, sees his father as an example of constant insincerity. To the sons is left the choice either to imitate the fathers in their dull routine, comfortably and willingly and slavishly carrying out orders from above, renouncing the promotion of any ideals and only thinking of a career and of the means to satisfy their inclinations, or – if the need for sincerity is too great and if the 'pernicious influences' of thoughts of freedom are strong enough – to take up the cause of the masses and prepare themselves for the extreme consequence, that of severing family ties. And it is just the irony of fate that the state of affairs in colonial society is most fiercely criticised by those who were themselves born in official circles. Lack of respect or ingratitude? Not a bit of it! The national conscience speaks louder than the voice of blood. And it is to be feared that in the coming epoch, under the influence of love of country, ties of love will be broken, family relations severed and personal relations cut off. For the national ideal all selfish motives and personal considerations must give way'.[1]

In free countries no such dilemma exists; there openly expressed differences of opinion make it possible always to be sincere. But the important point is that youth there knows that its time to go into action will come, and whatever its aspirations may be, once it has reached the age of manhood, it will be able to fight for them without having to sever intimate ties on that amount.

My Lord Chairman, Indonesian youth's involvement in politics has another specific character. Its Dutch counsellors dissuade it from taking to politics. 'They are certainly right where the youth

of a free people is concerned. In a free state politics means expressing oneself about government business, criticising government work, so as eventually to take control, which is certainly not the job of youth. In dominated countries politics has another far-reaching meaning; there it has more the meaning of propaganda for the idea of freedom, of impressing upon the people the meaning of freedom. To keep the youth of an oppressed people out of politics means to deny that youth the ideals of freedom. And that is the greatest crime against our land and people'.[2]

My Lord Chairman! There is still a third factor which hastens the emergence of ideals among Indonesian youth. It is that from childhood it undergoes the bitter experience of national and racial subordination. Already in primary school it feels the lashing blows of the colonial antithesis and the racial conflict. It studies this not from learned books but on its own skin. It experiences on its own body the sharp conflict between *white* and *brown*, between *ruler* and *ruled*.

No opportunity is lost to let it know that it is only part of the large group of 'dirty natives'. Yes, my Lord Chairman, *ad nauseam* must we hear and read all kinds of nice descriptions of our people, uttered and written by so-called 'cultured' people, who not only imagine themselves to be masters in our country but enrich themselves with treasures produced by the blood and sweat of the poor Kromo. We are not spared the insult of being told in our faces that 'the native is lazy, dirty, untrustworthy, dishonest, ungrateful, careless, improvident', and that he lacks energy, thrift, economic awareness and so on. This is not done unconsciously but deliberately to hit at our sensitivity. Every day we are specially reminded in this way that we belong to an unfree and therefore inferior people, with whom those in the colony can take any kind of liberty. But then you will understand, my Lord Chairman, that such derision and all the humiliations small and large inflicted upon us in our daily lives can only serve to bring about a hostile attitude towards the ruler.

But there is more! There is not a moment's hesitation to teach Indonesian youth the history of the Netherlands' heroic struggle to break free from Spanish domination. Youth is made aware that there is no right more holy and inalienable than the right of a people to rule itself, and to give itself the form of government which is best suited to its temperament and aspirations. Already at the European primary school the spirit of Indonesian youth is made receptive to love and esteem for European heroes of freedom

such as William Tell, Mazzini, Garibaldi, William of Orange and many more. But on the other hand, the history of its own country is put to it as the history of the *Dutch East Indies*, which begins with the arrival of a certain Mr. Houtman on the Bantam road. The glorious past of Indonesia is of course not presented to it. It is said that Indonesia has no history and that there is only a Dutch history in Indonesia, which is officially called the Dutch East Indies. And it is suggested to Indonesian youth that the so-called 'East Indies history' is a history of Dutch epics, which only magnifies the glory of the Dutch race and to which oppressed Indonesian people must show their perpetual devotion. The promotion of the latter is considered to be its duty. And is it not said that Indonesia 'is the cork on which Netherlands prosperity floats'? And it is said to be the task of Indonesian youth to cooperate towards the coming into being of Greater Holland. That, my Lord Chairman, is the kernel of the so-called East Indies history with which Indonesian youth is taunted from Primary school onwards. But on the other hand every opposition by the Indonesian princes and chiefs against the penetration of the whites is branded as rebellion and revolt. Thus, too, must Indonesian youth parrot its masters and call its own heroes, like Dipo Negoro, Toeankoe Imam, Tengkoe Oemar and many others, rebels, insurrectionists, terrorists and so on. But yet they, too, were national heroes just as were William of Orange, William Tell, Mazzini, Garibaldi, etc., to whom we owe reverence.

Indeed, my Lord Chairman! There can be no more excellent means of cultivating the rebellious spirit in Indonesian youth. Thanks to Dutch teaching, the national heroes and martyrs rise before its eyes. Those men who became martyrs in the cause of freedom have earned a place of honour in its heart. Its young heart opens out to the suffering of these martyrs, who had to waste the last days of their lives on a quiet island in the East of the Archipelago where only the beating of the surf of the Molucca Sea reminded them of the Ocean which washed the land of their birth. Is it now cause for amazement if the ideal of a free Fatherland already ripens in the minds of Indonesian youth while still at secondary school? If this is so, is it then strange if Indonesian academic youth is active in politics?

But also in everyday life, in daily intercourse, it is reminded time and time again how painful and humiliating it is to belong to an unfree people. Day in day out, in newspapers such as *Nieuws*

van den Dag voor Nederlands-Indië, like the *Soerabajaasch Handelsblad*, abuse of a deeply insulting kind pours forth, aimed at the Indonesian leaders for whom, according to them, 'the highest gallows are not high enough to hang them'. When we know that this scorn and humiliation is not spared even for moderate popular leaders such as Tjokroaminoto and Abdoel Moeis, and even leaders of the totally unrevolutionary Boedi Oetomo, then we learn something of the atititude of mind of the average Tropical Dutchman and the representatives of his public opinion in Indonesia. That is how Dutch culture is presented to us!

My Lord Chairman! In this colonial society now, a society of sharp racial conflicts, of racial hatred and discrimination, Indonesian youth has grown up. Already from its earliest years it carries a piece of 'colonial experience' with it along the path of life. Only that part of it which thinks solely of its own future and its own good fortune and *rejects all ideals*, and thus docilely takes the food of the morals of slavery can cheerfully overcome it.

The Indonesian students who have come to strengthen the membership of Perhimpoenan Indonesia have for the most part been associated with youth organizations in the Fatherland and are in the nature of things fully aware of the state of affairs in Indonesia. With the 'colonial experience' which they have gained and with bitterness in their hearts they come over here, to the land of their masters. Where they had previously experienced nothing but derision and humiliation and had always felt oppression all around them, it is a revelation to them to look around in their new society where they, at least in theory – it can be otherwise in practice as this sensational case against us shows – are under the protection of the same law and have the same civil rights as those who, in their country, behave like superior beings. It is as if another sky is arching out over their heads. They become aware here of the feeling of freedom; they feel relieved of the narrow and suffocating atmosphere of colonial society. This strengthens in them the consciousness of their vocation to become future leaders of their people. Thus the awareness of the need to prepare themselves during their student years for their future task! The cause of our keen action is thus *not*, as *De Locomotief* would have us believe, due to the fact that we, being cut off from our own society and suddenly placed in full Western life, have become unbalanced. No, my Lord Chairman, that is not the true cause. The truth is that we have been set free from the colonial hypnosis and have therefore become self-

confident. From here we can see the *colonial* truth clearly. And this is what our action is based on.

My Lord Chairman! A stay in this country is of great value to Indonesian youth! Because by learning to know the Dutch society itself it learns at the same time to reduce the so-called superiority of the white race, so inflatedly presented in Indonesia as a psychological injection to the oppressed people, to its true proportions. It learns, from being exposed to it at close quarters, about 'the strongly individualistic character' of the average Dutchman; further – to use the words of Henri Polak –[3] 'his petty bourgeois suspiciousness', 'his small mindedness and meanness', his appetite for 'hopeless secretarianism, etc.'. This brings it to turning things over in the mind and to the conviction that the Dutch people cannot be the people to educate Indonesia towards independence. Again the study of Dutch political history gives further corroboration to this impression. Thus Indonesian youth also finds out that the old Republic of the Netherlands, founded by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1579 the starting point of the Dutch nation, was *not* a republic where the spirit of solidarity ruled, which was most necessary at the time, but a republic of bickering provinces in which provincialism, local selfishness, an appetite for chop-logic, for hair-splitting and nit-picking reigned supreme. History also shows that the Netherlands, because of its 'petty bourgeois suspiciousness', is *incapable* of bringing about anything substantial or great in the field of politics, *incapable* within a reasonable time of making its own structure conform to the demands of the times. This incapability is all too often concealed behind the mask of 'Dutch solidity'. Where this is already the case in respect of their own form of government can anything better be expected of them for the colony? The political patchwork – the word is Prof. Kleintjes' – which the Dutch parliament brought into being in 1925 under the name of Netherlands Indies Form of Government Act is a typical product of that 'petty bourgeois suspiciousness'.

On Holland's *incapability* for effective politics Prof Kranenburg writes in his standard work:[4]

'The Dutch did not understand how to bring about the reform of their political structure *with their own strength*. The heavy pressure of a foreign power, the need and misery of the beginning of the 19th century, were necessary for the state unity proclaimed in 1798 to be made a reality and to bring about a regularly functioning coherent system. A further *century* was needed for the most

important principles of the 1798 constitution to materialise, although in an entirely different form than laid down therein.'

So much for Kranenburg! Thus we have evidence regarding Holland's ineptness and sluggishness in effective politics from one of the best known Dutch scholars of constitutional law. The history of the ministerial responsibility which, after initial acceptance in the written constitution of 1848, needed twenty years to work properly and to achieve final validity, the woeful story of universal suffrage – all this justifies the belief of Indonesian nationalists that the Netherlands will never be in a position to bring about political reform in Indonesia which will be in harmony with the spirit of the times.

But next to that political impotence there is still another disgusting thing which also determines the direction of Dutch colonial politics. It is selfishness and egotism! The desire to take as much advantage as possible out of the colony makes the Netherlands follow a policy that barely takes any account of the wishes and longings of the colonial population.

By the study and analysis of the colonial problem Indonesian youth sees established what it already felt intuitively and from its own experience, that the purpose of the colonisation is purely to quench material hunger with the rich colonial treasure. It is not, as is so often falsely suggested, to bring Western culture to the colonised people. Because never has colonisation been started in the service of philanthropy, to satisfy the wish for education of 'less civilized' people. Thus Indonesian youth sees as the dominating factor in the colonial relationship: an *implacable* conflict of interests between motherland and colony. It learns all the better to understand what it has already experienced with its own body, that the colonial society, in which two peoples of different race live in a relationship of rulers and ruled, is ultimately governed by the *race* conflict. This racial conflict becomes more intense as the native society develops by its own ability, and becomes a *racial hatred.* This racial hatred was first preached by the Tropical Dutchmen themselves, particularly by the representatives of their public opinion such as the *Nieuws van de dag*, *Soerabajaasch Handelsblad*, etc. Accustomed as they were to looking down on the Indonesians and behaving like *Tuan Besars* (big lords, or 'bara sahibs') at the time when the Indonesian masses still slept the sleep of lethargy, they now find it unusual and most unfitting when a few out of the mass stand up to make it conscious of its rights. The

intellectuals are now called 'Ungrateful Inlanders' because they, themselves educated in European schools, dare presume to demand political rights for the docile oppressed people.

My Lord Chairman! This *preaching of racial hatred* is purely a psychological symptom – a psychological consequence of the instinct for self-preservation, or rather for the preservation of *power* of a white minority that feels itself threatened, living in the midst of an awakening population of millions. They wished with contempt and humiliation to stem 'the rising tide of colour'. Whoever has faithfully followed the two newspapers mentioned over the past two decades will know that what I have said here is true. But in spite of that continuous sowing of hatred and that baiting campaign those two newspapers are never criminally prosecuted.

In Indonesia one can insult the *Kromo* with impunity! And understandably so, because all those words are as if taken from the hearts of the Tropical Dutch who feel themselves to be rulers. The government and in many respects justice also fall under that hypnosis. Thus people in Indonesia speak of *racial justice* and of measuring by two standards. I will speak about this later.

From this free Holland, known as the land of Grotius, liberated from the suffocating pressure of the colonial atmosphere, more mature Indonesian youth can review the colonial relationship better. The analysis of the colonial problem brings it to the conclusion that the salvation of the national existence must come from itself. It feels that it is chosen from among the people to prepare for the rebirth of the Indonesian nation. It begins to realise that it is absurd in the given world order to make an appeal to the generosity and the sense of justice of the ruler for the independence of its beloved fatherland. It is too impressed by the truth of what was said by Prof. Mr. W. van der Vlugt:

'Next to the abuse of power by the strong there is only one course of action that gives an even more disgusting impression: the attitude of the weak who flirts with his powerlessness and wishes for no other shield than the unprincipled appeal to the generosity of others.'[5]

As sons of the country themselves, the Indonesians studying here in this country feel themselves to be the real repositories of the task, to which they feel called. In them the people will place more trust, and from them will it seek its protection. They feel how beautiful is the task of the intellectual sons of a country over which a foreign nation of another race wields the sceptre. Their first

calling must be to make their people see its humiliation as an intolerable evil, to ignite the urge for freedom in it and thus truly to value the greatest possession of humanity: national freedom.[6]

The deep awareness that the independence of the Fatherland is only achievable through its own strength and ability and the consciousness of their calling to lead their own people from darkness into light arouse in many Indonesians studying here in this country the readiness to set aside their own interests and to renounce themselves. Thus for them their stay here in this country, or somewhere in another European cultural centre, is not exclusively to study to acquire knowledge that will assure them of a position in Indonesian society, but also to train themselves politically and to *prepare themselves* for the greatest task in their future.

Certainly, my Lord Chairman, this does not hold true for *all* Indonesians who are studying here because, as I have already observed in a few words, there are enough who only think of their own careers and therefore *have nothing to do with the fostering of any ideals*. But for Perhimpoenan Indonesia, the association of *the best part* of Indonesian youth studying here, the principle set out here certainly is valid, that personal interest must be subordinated to the interests of the Fatherland and the happiness of the people. It is this part of Indonesian youth studying here that is fully conscious of its calling! But see there too the reason why Indonesian student youth is active in politics! Thus *Indonesia Merdeka*[7] can also bear witness to this:

'Gripped by the events in the Fatherland the Indonesians staying in the Netherlands can no longer appear indifferent. They are students, but they are above all Indonesians. The cause of the Fatherland reaches to their hearts. The Indonesian association (Perhimpoenan Indonesia) is only an "advance post" of the Indonesian National Movement. Just like a "sensitive barometer" it reacts to political-economic phenomena. It is therefore absurd to claim that it is under any influence from the Leyden school. It interprets only the patriotism that is carried in the hearts and minds of millions of partisans over yonder. Compelled to act and supported by the realisation that closer unity only offers a greater chance of success, it declares itself solidly with the popular action launched in the Fatherland'.

3. PERHIMPOENAN INDONESIA: PERIOD OF LOYALTY

Mr. President! After having explained why the young people of Indonesia enter into politics at such an early age, I come to *Perhimpoenan Indonesia*, in order to trace briefly its origin, its principles and its action! The original name was 'East Indian Association'. It was established in this country in 1908, in the same year, that in Indonesia itself the first nationalist Union 'Boedi Oetomo' saw the light of day, within the walls of the medical school *Stovia* at Weltevreden. The Boedi Oetomo as well as the Perhimoenan Indonesia, were originally student-organisations. And here I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the oldest Indonesian Nationalist Organizations are in fact *student*-organizations. This is a normal phenomenon in every country that is dominated, with every nation that is dominated!

However, *no* parallelism in development exists between the Boedi Oetomo and Perhimpoenan Indonesia. Whereas the Boedi Oetomo remained at its original standard, a union of Javenese intellectuals, Perhimpoenan Indonesia, although in substance remaining a student organization – and how could it be else, since it was so far removed from the national soil? – has gradually developed from a social association into a radical nationalist union with political tendencies, earnestly recommending its members, once they had returned to the East Indies, to go to the masses and struggle with the masses.

The development of Perhimpoenan Indonesia can be divided into the following periods: –

I. 1908-1913
II. 1913-1919
III. 1919-1923
V. 1923- up to the time of writing.

The *first* period is characterized by an understandable searching and groping. Strictly speaking the foundation of the then East India Association was more due to the need felt by East Indians abroad to come together regularly than to a consciously felt calling to fulfil an historical task. Hence, its main purpose was, as article 2 of the regulations reads:

'To promote the common interests of Indonesians in The Netherlands and to keep in touch with the Netherlands East Indies'.

The tone at the meetings was in fact weak. Although it was mainly a social association, it nevertheless bore a seed of patriotism.

Evidently it could not have remained blind with eyes open or pretend not to hear what was happening in East Asia. Soon enough this came to be expressed in an amendment to article 2 of the regulations in which it was determined that, apart from a closer association, *the community feeling* of Indonesians studying in The Netherlands should also be fostered, and as a result the feeling of belonging to the same community. Thus the Great-Indonesian idea entered the association.[8]

However, a new life in the East Indian Association only began, when in 1913 the victims of the Netherlands Centenary Celebrations, R. M. Suardhy Surjaningrat, Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo and Douwes Dekker, arrived in The Netherlands as exiles and became the exponents of the *New Opinion.*

The second period had begun!

The appearance of Suardhy changed the mood of the meetings as if by magic. These meetings were usually attended by Dutch advisers as well. 'Certainly the tone remained equally courteous, but the underlying causes of bitterness could no longer be denied. And how could it be otherwise? Wat is not Suardhy who experienced that the hand of authority could come down mercilessly on one who, in a colony where that authority must be upheld, thought he had to infuse a more powerful life into political awareness?'[9] And slowly but surely the monster to be feared most: 'politics' penetrated into the association. This was the sign for many Dutch supporters, who had observed this unavoidable process in the association for a long time, to withdraw their confidence. One sees, Mr President, to what extent many so-called well-meaning Dutch people are inclined to help their 'younger brown brothers'! The sympathy of this category of Dutch people towards Indonesia's endeavours ceases as soon as 'politics' come up for discussion even, as was the case with the East Indian Association, when these politics are expressed in a loyal form. One is not allowed to speak of Indonesia's independence! But once driven into political channels, the East Indian Association was not to be dissuaded. When in the turbulent November days of 1918 the Government of the Netherlands East Indies, led by the Governor-General, Count van Limburg Stirum, under pressure of circumstances was obliged to make the famous November promise in the National Council, in which political reforms for Indonesia were foreshadowed, the committee of the day issued a statement, in the name of the General Meeting, wherein the necessity of the fulfilment of these promises was ad-

vocated and demanded.[10] One was in the middle of politics, the talks at the meetings dripped with politics; the question of Indonesia's independence was on. But in general the spirit of the East India Association was, that one should have confidence in the 'good intentions of the ruler'.

Mr. President! It was also in that turbulent time, in the autumn of 1917, that leading figures from Indonesian, Dutch and Chinese student organisations put their heads together in order to consider the possibility of the formation of a general association, which would embrace all those who were preparing themselves for a field of activity in the Netherlands Indies.[11] Thus the *Indonesian League* was founded, to which organizations only could be admitted as members.

The period of the actual *co-operation* between the Dutch and Indonesians in one League had started, but only sad results were booked. At a lustrum of the Indologists Association, a member of the Indonesian League, to which the East Indian Association was invited, a sharp conflict arose between Dutch and Indonesian; the cause being that an Indologist made a plea for the East India Company. It was to be expected that conflicts would be unavoidable. A League of groups who have diametrically opposed objectives is fated to be shortlived. Nevertheless it was hoped that through multiple contacts agreement could finally be reached. Although the mutual conviction was that each other's objective were incompatible, it was nevertheless believed that up to a certain point they could go along with each other.

However, at the first Congress of the Indonesian League at Wageningen, heated opinions from both sides could not be avoided. Mr. President, it was maintained, the possibility to appreciate and understand each other, with the preservation of each other's objectives could not be precluded. However, at the second Congress at the Zoo in The Hague things became even more heated, when among other things the question was tabled: 'What will, can and may Indonesia expect from The Netherlands?'. It was so noisy there that the Chairman of the League, Mr. Jonkman, spoke of the 'Hague Fury'. At the third Congress at Deventer in 1919 it went no better, rather worse! 'The good expected from the *co-operation* so highly praised, was not forthcoming and instead of the *rapprochement* wished for an almost unbridgeable 'abyss' of dizzying depth existed between both groups'.[12]

Under the heading *The anti-thesis at Deventer*, Mr. J. E. Stok-

vis in the *Koloniale Weekblad* of 18th September 1919, delivered a dissertation on that Third Congress of the Indonesian League, wherein, amongst other things, he wrote:[13]

'Our Dutch students are in a happy and beautiful position, They stand ready, as children of a free nation, as rulers, to go to the Netherlands East Indies, provided with full titles, which at that place often degenerate into privileges.

The Indonesian students on the other hand, came here after an already bitter experience of national and racial subordination, which was their lot from childhood. Precisely their association with their free Dutch friends, nationally and intellectually well provided for, must have made them feel still more deeply what lacked and experienced in their own country, and must make them feel all the more resentful. Whenever there is an opportunity to give vent to their feelings, that opportunity will eagerly be used. The Dutch student, naturally, will not fail to answer, and the colonial conflict is there, straightforward and in all its sharpness.'

Mr. President, I am citing here the words of an unbiased critic like Mr. J. E. Stokvis, who has a keen perception of this colonial problem, in order to give you in advance the opportunity to draw a conclusion for yourself as to which results that so highly praised 'co-operation' must lead. By and by you will then better understand the non-co-operation-politics of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, which I still shall consider in more detail!

On posing the question, whether the Indonesian League was justified in repeatedly putting this colonial question first and foremost in their own circle, which question Mr. Stokvis answered in the negative, he said further in the same article:

'If only a beginning were made to put a stop to the full and at the same time idle debates about domination, and to devote the congress more to the problems, which cover the *abolition* of that domination, the various parties in the League would find each other in what unites, and not in what by preference advances the division'.

Mr. President, Mr. Stokvis speaks of the *abolition of domination*, but, Mr. President, this is precisely the vital point on which the 'necessary parties in the League' will *never* be able to agree! And the possibility of a fruitful co-operation depends largely on this being able to agree.

The author of 'Retrospective View' in our Memoriam Volume says, in our opinion rightly, that Mr. Stokvis gave the means to achieve the end the League had in mind, at the same time giving an

indication of the absurdity of joining in one League such absolute antipodes as the East Indian Association, the Cadets Association, Naval Cadets Association, etc.[14]

For the Dutch members of the Indonesian League, with very few exceptions, do not *want* that abolition; at the outside they *accept* that abolition as the inevitable result of an inexorable law of world history.[15]

This was the state of affairs at the beginning of the third period in 1919. The new arrivals in the Association, who ushered in this period, turned out to have been the catalyst in the transformation process which was in the course of being enacted since the arrival of Suardhy Surjaningrat. The East Indian Association was then in the constellation of national renovation.

Remarkable is the striking resemblance which the development of the Association shows to that of the popular movement in the fatherland, a resemblance which made an ex-chairman of the East Indian Association speak of 'the sensitive barometer of the great event in the Netherlands East Indies'.[16]

But at the beginning of this third period there was still a basis of political co-operation. However, the spirit in the Indonesian League had weakened. It had its best time during the congresses mentioned. Disappointed by the negative results of 'co-operation', the feeling of self-confidence started to rise in the East Indian Association. The name *East Indian Association* now began to be altered to *Indonesian Association* (1922). The new name implied at the same time the *political* name given to the Fatherland. Accepting the consequences of this decision, the editors of the former *Hindia Poetra* succeeded in making the General Meeting accept the change of name of this organ into: *Indonesia Merdeka*. Thus the name of this paper now completely backs the object in view: *Indonesia Merdeka*, that is *Indonesia free*! Finally, in the autumn of 1923, tired of the fruitless co-operation, the East Indian Association took the definite decision to withdraw from the Indonesian League. Shortly afterwards the League was dissolved. However, Mr. President, the sad result of the 'co-operation' was, however, not the only reason that compelled the Indonesian Association to change its course. The *disappointment* the Indonesian Association experienced over the illusions it entertained for the fulfilment of the *November promise* by the ruler also had a considerable influence on this decision. From the negation of this promise we have been able to learn these wise lessons, that no terms for the

idea 'Indonesia free from Holland' are to be found in practical colonial politics. Each political step towards this end can only be *extorted*. So it was with the National Council and so it will be in the future. We have experienced that, once the fear of the November days wore off, Holland could boldly state on formal legal grounds, that the November promise did not have to be fulfilled. But through that the Indonesian Association became convinced that the Indonesian Nation can only obtain justice once it is capable of posing the *question of power*. Its trust in the ruler was lost; self-confidence arose more and more. All this led to the *non-co-operation principle*.

With the acceptance of this principle began the *fourth* period! During this period the change of name of the association into *Perhimpoenan Indonesia* was carried through.

Mr. President! In tracing briefly the development of Perhimpoenan Indonesia it is not in the least my intention to give this tribunal an historical outline. I only do this to focus your attention on the fact, that Perhimpoenan Indonesia never lacked the will to co-operate with the ruler for the future of its country, and that originally it had good faith in the 'good intentions of The Netherlands'. In spite of repeated disappointments it has tried for five years to co-operate with the young people among the rulers, in so far as they were interested in the colonies. Until finally the irreconcilable contrasting interests forced it to choose its own way.

The definite acceptance of the non-co-operation principle is therefore not a suddenly arisen 'naughty boy's whim', but has most certainly a profound background. Faith in the 'good will' of the ruler, to set Indonesia free sooner or later, has been lost. Presently I shall defend this point of view further with official declarations of the Association!

Mr. President! At the start I already spoke of political and psychological factors, which are influencing the trend of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. With the help of a few quotations from 'Indonesia Merdeka' and our Memorial Volume I have explained that 'like a sensitive barometer, it only responds to political and economic phenomena' in Indonesia. If one is to understand the action of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, one has to be alive at all that has happened in Indonesia since the famous November promise. I repeat, Mr. President, these events are reflected in the actions of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. I shall therefore leave this subject for the time being, to return to it later on, as soon as I have – figuratively speaking – made an excursion with you to Indonesia in order

to get a broad impression of the development of the situation in the last few years.

4. THE REACTIONARY ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNOR-GENERAL FOCK

Mr. President! I will take the year 1918, the year of the famous November promise, as starting point, because from that moment on a new national political life began in the Netherlands East Indies!

When at the end of the war years everywhere in Europe the spectres of revolution appeared and in the Netherlands as well a revolution, led by Mr. Troelstra, threatened to be unleashed, the Government of the Netherlands East Indies, which also lived in fear, thought it advisable to give in to the moderate demands of the Indonesian National movement. The Government of the Netherlands East Indies, under the leadership of the Governor-General, Count van Limburg Stirum, gave on the 18th November 1918 in the National Council the aforementioned November promise, in which among other things they declared:

'The new course, which recent world events have dictated for The Netherlands, determines at the same time the course which will have to be followed here as well.'[17]

And on 2nd December 1918 the *Government Attorney* for public affairs added the following explanation:

'What did the Government intend to say by its declaration? When I pose this question, the mind naturally turns to the latest world events and to the consequent result in the sphere of politics. Everywhere the necessity for radical reforms in public institutions is pushed forward, with a view to new principles as well, or – where they have already been accepted – at a quicker tempo, so that much which was deemed to be attainable in a far distant time, is now within shorter reach.

No individual who stands in the midst of life can ignore this general trend; neither can a Government, even supposing it wants to – resist this general trend. The Government accepts the consequences, arising from the urge originating from important groups in the Colonies, to follow here as well the new course which is already pursued in The Netherlands.'

Because of this solemn promise made by the Government of the Netherlands East Indies, the Indonesian Nation believed in the

good faith of the ruler. They believed indeed, that the foreshadowed political reforms, whereby the native population should henceforth have an important share in the government of the country, would be realized. In their childish naivety this subjugated nation believed indeed, that this November promise was the beginning of the execution of the modern gospel of President Wilson concerning the right of nations to govern themselves. The report of the *East Indian Revision Committee* under the chairmanship of Professor Carpentier Alting, kept alive the hopeful expectations of the Indonesians with regard to the political future of Indonesia. But the faith of a subjugated people turned out to be a childish faith, hardly fitting in the framework of modern hyprocritical politics. Because the latter is only too loyal to its tradition to attach any value to what was dished up to the world as truth with pen and tongue. The further one got removed from those November days, the more that promise got dragged about in the Netherlands. Instead of more say in the nation's politics and instead of more political freedom, the East Indies experienced a situation of *more lack of freedom*. The same Mr. Fock, who at a session of the Second Chamber in 1919 made a strong plea for the *non*-compliance with this November promise, was sent to the East Indies to succeed the ethical Count van Limburg-Stirum as Governor-General. The first action of his government was to announce *drastic cuts in expenditure* in order to restore the state-budget. Rigorous economies were enforced on the estimates of agriculture, education and hygiene, thus hitting heavily the most vital national interests. On the other hand the population, which had already experienced the repercussions of the turn in the market trend, was still more heavily taxed. Different kinds of taxes, exceeding by far their payment capacities, weighed upon them. The impoverishment of the population was such – and I shall come back to this later with figures – that the very capable regent, R. A. A. A. Djaja-Diningrat, in an excellent speech at the session of the National Council on 18th January 1924, made the following announcement, which threw a sharp light on the *massive malnutrition* of the East Indian population.

'Mr. Chairman! Better than from theoretical speculations and calculations, which as a rule are not totally indisputable, you would get a good impression if you yourself went to have a look in the country. Thousands of people have to be satisfied during at least three months of the year with one meal per day instead of two. Thousands are obliged to make up the difference in their budgets

by tightening their belts or they have to fill their stomachs with gadoend, pisang tubers mixed with young papajas and the like. Nevertheless there are among these categories of people those who have to pay *f* 10,– to *f* 12,50 in taxes per year. It is a favourable time to obtain a picture of the situation. I would therefore suggest to the National Council that, after the sumptuous dinners and artistic musical evenings, by way of relaxation, they make an excursion to the villages I have in mind here (that is Gelam, district of Serang). Mr. Chairman! Under the smoke of Batavia the situation is still worse, because mediaeval conditions still exist there conditions which have been sharply condemned by the former Member of Parliament Mr. D. Fock.
There are still people there who have an income of only *f*65,– per year and yet have to pay taxes amounting to *f*26,–. This is a terrible state of affairs.'[28]

Mr. President! These evils not only existed in the Department of Serang, but almost everywhere in Java; the abuses in central Java were still worse. But the population in the Outer Provinces was also not free from excessive tax burdens.

The speech by the *demang Datoek Kajo*, made in the National Council in the course of 1927, can throw some light on the rigorous way tax-money was collected. Instead of considering us, native civil servants, as co-operators in affairs of government – so he complained – the European Government officials degrade us to tax-collectors. We are being classified in grades. And our capacities, on which our promotion depends, are mostly assessed on the amount of taxes we are able to collect. In this way we are from a high quarter more or less forced knowingly and willingly, wittingly or unwittingly to oppress the population.[19]

Indeed, Mr. President, a fine testimony from an East Indian civil servant, for whom the detestable system was apparently becoming too much.[20]

Mr. President! The accumulating affects of the increasing poverty of the population and the ever heavier burden of taxation, together with the rigorous way of collecting these taxes, were not long in coming. First of all this found expression in the increasing dissatisfaction and bitterness among the great masses. But among the intellectuals that same dissatisfaction and bitterness was noted. Not only did they feel deceived by the repudiation of the November promise, but the neglect of care for the most vital interests of the population aroused great exasperation everywhere. Now that

political awareness had become common property, this attitude led the Government to take a different course. The reactionary administration of Mr. D. Fock had lost it the faith of the East Indian population in the Government. This mistrust led to the rise of the *non-co-operation movement*, which was originally only intended as a *protest* against the violation of the November promise and against the curtailment of government care concerning the most vital interests of the population.

It was therefore in those days that the Radical Concentration – a concentration of practically all Indonesian parties together with the ISDP – issued a manifesto with the following programme demands:

a. Increase of tax on large capital and decrease of income tax.
b. Increase of government aid in respect of unemployed Indonesians.
c. Better care of national education and national health by the government; therefore no cutting down in this field.
d. Granting of freedom of movement.
e. Redemption by the Government of the November promise.

These programme demands, sober, moderate and reasonably stated, were hardly considered by the government. One could not even hope for the realisation of item c which was such an urgent item for the Indonesians. The results were quite the opposite. The Government, who seemed determined to enforce in every respect their own demands considered the Radical Concentration as dangerous. The horrible espionnage system was applied to that association; as soon as a meeting was held, the government knew precisely what was discussed at that meeting within a few hours.[21]

It is understandable that in these circumstances the statements in the native press and those expressed during national assemblies gave increasing evidence of bitterness. Already in those days correspondents of the *Telegraaf* and the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* in Indonesia, who judging from their letters sent overseas had a keen insight into the social relationships in Indonesia, came to the general conclusion that the Government of G.-G. Fock had only led to stiffer opposition. 'Cooperation' was demanded, but that cooperation was made practically impossible. By this policy of the Iron Hand the non-cooperative movement gained more and more support. This however is normal and unavoidable for a people with pronounced nationalist feeling.[22]

Mr. President, I already said that the non-cooperation policy was originally intended in Indonesia as a protest against the reac-

tionary policy of the government. But instead of removing the causes of the grievances, the Netherlands East Indian Government started to consider measures to suppress the embittered statements in the press and during meetings.

a. *Censorship of the press*

In order to curtail the embittered statements in the newspapers the government of Mr. Fock predicted in 1924 censorship on the newspapers. And thus the government got themselves in a dangerous position. Already in the middle of the past century, on the occasion of the discussion of the first Netherlands East Indian Government Regulation in the Second Chamber, some liberal people, amongst them Thorbecke, emphasized that also for Indonesia freedom of the press was the only right directive. 'Because the objections arisen amongst the population would be expressed in the press and would give the government the opportunity to institute an impartial investigation and to remove justified grievances. Without free power of speech the grievances would accumulate in the mind and this could become dangerous. The group therefore pleaded for repressive measures, in order to curtail possible excesses of the press and emphatically rejected preventive measures. But the Chamber of 1854 thought otherwise, accepted the present article, in which everything was left to the government, a way out which at the time when the Government Regulation came into effect, was always preferred in the case of a clash with important principles.'

This was absolutely in keeping with the despotic government of Mr. Fock, i.e. to suppress through censorship the keen opposition in the press. It was quite a normal thing in those days for printed papers to be seized. And in particular the Communist papers *Api* and *Njala* were the victims. As if in this way the discontentment of the population could be removed. As if one could suppress sharp opposition in this way.

Against this censorship *Indonesia Merdeka* already at that time issued a warning:

'That which the Netherlands East Indian Government now wishes to do is a step backwards, a return to Napoleontic time, in which the Netherlands experienced what it meant to have the press censored. That which Holland herself feels as a burden, as oppression, the representatives of that same Holland would now like to do to us. That which you would not wish upon yourselves, do not inflict

on others eithers. Have the honourable governing gentlemen ever considered this simple saying?'

The plans were made to counteract the excesses of the press, or so was said. But these measures can (and also will, we are convinced of this) have the opposite result. The ban on unions and meetings has already strongly promoted or created secret action. The censorship of the press will advance this even further. The government will find themselves jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. Now freedom of speech is a sort of outlet, which prevents too high pressure from building up in the national steam boiler. If this outlet is wantonly removed by the government then it will come to an outburst and this will happen at a time when one would not even suspect such a thing could happen. Because even the Netherlands East Indian Government does not have enough spies to observe accurately and silently the working movement in the immensity of Indonesia. If it comes to that then those who have warned the government in time against the results of the reactionary measures, can confidently say: Vous l'avez voulu![24]

Mr. President, more than three and a half years ago we gave these warnings and the facts have acknowledged the correctness of our viewpoint!

b. *Ban on meetings and terrorisation*

Mr. President! The Netherlands East Indian Government reacted in an even sadder way to the keen critisism of public meetings. It has always been the weak governors who did not dare to analyse their own faults. The Netherlands East Indian Government has always been inclined to think that the national movement is the work of some 'rebels' and 'agitators' who wished to overthrow the government. 'In this it shows a gross misunderstanding of the fact that a leader only consciously expresses that which is still subconsciously stirring in the people'. The movement is not the result of the work of some agitators, but it flows from deeper psychological economic causes. Instead of putting the blame on some prominent persons, the Netherlands East Indian Government should search its own heart and ask it in the first place whether perhaps it is not its own fault that the tone of the meetings and the press become more and more bitter and fierce.[25]

Public meetings are dispersed by the police without any specific reason. The government of Mr. Fock did not seem to realise that it

is a general psychological phenomenon that the more drastic the government acts against an organised group, the less sensitive this group becomes and the more it is driven in a radical direction. His harsh action against the national movement already became evident in 1923, when the trade union of Railway and Tram Personnel, in support of the wage claims of the sugar factory workers threatened that they would call a sympathy strike towards the time of the milling campaign. The principal leader of that trade union was arrested, on the grounds of the Rebellion Article of the Penal Code. This provided the Netherlands East Indian Government at the same time with a welcome motive to create the most infamous Penal Code Article 161 bis, an article which not only contained the ban on strikes but which also offered the government ample opportunity to carry out 'legally' every arbitrariness. This reads as follows:
'He, who with the object of disturbing public order and causing disruption of the economic life of society, or being aware and reasonably being able to suspect that disturbance of the public order or disruption of the economic life of society will be the result, occasions or promotes that more people neglect or, in spite of legally given orders, refuse activities, which they have undertaken to carry out or which on the grounds of their employment conditions they have to carry out, will be punished by prison sentences of a maximum of five years or a fine of a maximum of one thousand guilders'.

Those who know the elasticity of the Netherlands East Indian Penal Code and those who are also not unaware of the very broad interpretation of the provisions of the law by the government and justice in Indonesia, understand that the government by this proclamation can literally commit any injustice and any arbitrariness, while formally invoking the 'Law'.

But how did the Ban on Meetings work out in practice? In the important factory and political centres the right of meeting was simply abolished so that Article 111 RR became a dead letter. Theoretically there was only a territorial abolition of the right of meeting. But where the ban on meetings was not announced the police took care that the meeting could not take place. And it often happened that meetings were forcefully disbanded. The *Vrijheidsbondse* (Free Union) Governor-General Fock has created in Indonesia *police* terrorism. Yes, Mr. President, perhaps there are people in this hall who shrink from the word 'terrorism'. One would perhaps like to use another word for it, but for us, the suppressed,

all this is called 'terrorism'. When later on I recall evidence of samples of arbitrariness which in Indonesia one used to commit 'in the name of the King' then I am convinced that you too, servants of justice, will agree with me that the qualification 'terrorism' is too mild. It was on the occasion of this terrorist action by the police against public meetings and of the way in which G-G Fock started to mess about with the so-called 'right of unions and meetings' that *Indonesia Merdeka*[26] in 1925 made the following statement:
' "The right of union and meeting of the citizens is recognised". This has been laid down for the last ten years in the RR in all its cynical cruelty. One would say at first sight that one has finally arrived at the recognition of the right that Indonesians have always known, that has always existed in the set-up of their democratic institutions (village consulations, mass protest). One cannot of course imagine village life without the right of meeting. In reality this inclusion of the regulation in the law of principles has been the beginning of the misery, it has become the start of limitations, alterations and violations. Just because of this the eye of the Netherlands Government has fallen on this ancient Indonesian right. The fearful mind, which sees a ghost in clear daylight in everything, grasps after measures of a suspicious nature. Each "koempoelan" each public amusement meeting, it watches with a leering, sneaking eye. It is the height of ridicule. One can only look down upon this petty behaviour with a contemptuous smile in view of these actions which are not exactly expressions of the self-confident power of which the oppressor government boasts so much . . . If article 111 RR was edited as follows: "The right of union and meeting of Indonesians is *not* recognised", then nothing is changed, then that article "has gained in honesty and sincerity". Von Jhering already learned years ago that one can only speak of a right if this right can be realised. Without this possibility of realisation there is only a ghost show, which does not throw a noble light on the character of the ruling power.'

If one looks up the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, evening edition of 29th December, 1925 and *De Telegraaf* of the same date, one will be surprised to see how and to what extent this limitation of the right of meeting was handled. This applied not only to the employees in the sugar industry, to unions of dock-workers and seamen, but also the employees' union in the railway and tram companies in the whole of Java, Madura, Sumatra and Celebes and to the ban on meetings for coachmen's unions, to

Indonesian boy-scouts in the residence of Pekalongan and to employees in the batik industry in Soerakarta.[27]

And to what degree they even extended this pettiness may appear from the following example. When the VSTP (Union of Railway and Tram employees) announced their congress on the 24th December, 1925 at Solo, they first permitted the VSTP delegates from the whole of Indonesia to come to Solo to prepare for the Congress. And on the day of the congress itself, the meetings ban was proclaimed, so that those people, who had sacrified so much and saved so hard to pay for their travel and accomodation expenses, came to Solo in vain and could now return to their respective places of residence without anything to show for it.[28]

Mr. President! A government which in its arbitrariness seeks a means to enjoy itself at other people's expense certainly does not deserve any respect from the population. But the colonial community is only a place where the white rulers can enjoy themselves while watching the grief of the outcast 'natives' and where they could earn medals and finally live to a ripe old age on a fat pension.

But should not such government arbitrariness make the Indonesian mass population even more bitter? Indeed, Mr. President, the despotic governmental machine of the 'liberal' Mr. Fock has caused the 'gentlest people on earth' to become rebellious. The Indonesian people now know how to gauge the contents of that sort of 'Netherlands liberalism'; freedom in their own country for themselves, but also freedom for themselves in the colony to use unlimited force of power.

But also the private meetings, Mr. President, were not safe from the accomplices of the colonial government. The spies penetarated into the meeting halls and watched their victims like vultures.

In spite of the radical economic measures, which were carried out at the cost of the most vital interests of the population, like education, hygiene and agriculture, the government of Mr. Fock still appeared to have at its disposal some thousands of guilders for the maintenance of the monstrous 'secret service'. If for instance he had used the money provided for this 'secret service' for the improvement of education or for the sanitation of some lower quarters, he would have had better means of somewhat lessening the discontent of the population. This certainly would not have amounted to much, but in any case it would have given the appearance that the government was full of good will but that they did not have the proper means. *Indonesia Merdeka* now rightly states:

'Every unpopular government dithers between two ideas. Consideration of prestige and fear of unexpected events. The doubt resulting from this makes it lose all sense of tact, with the consequence that its measures instead of creating the desired prestige really become ridiculous in the eyes of the masses who by now are prepared to stop at nothing.'[29]

The provocative behaviour of the police had been so bad that the Member of Parliament Mr. Wiesing thought that he should draw the attention of the government to this. He said:[30]

'A private meeting could not be stopped. But the police now started to check meticulously whether everybody had their membership card on them and did this again and again until the time allocated for the meeting had run out.

Another case. Those who had joined the Sarikat Rajat, were visited in the evening by a policeman who gave them a card and every few hours during the night they were woken up and demanded to show this card personally. Briefly, they were kept awake most of the night until they officially terminated their membership of Sarikat Rajat.'

Is it surprising therefore that such mediaeval barbaric measures to fight against the revival of the population, amongst whom the government themselves had created discontent, of necessity led to underground action. We have repeatedly warned the Netherlands East Indian Government against this. But they maintained their point of view that one should not pay any attention to such statements of those, whom they called 'louts'. Without even taking the trouble to investigate the stated grievances they were immediately prepared to call us instigators of discontent or rebels. I feel obliged to quote hereunder some of these warnings, which were published in several volumes of the Indonesia Merdeka:

a. *Indonesia Merdeka* no. 2, 1924, page 32:

'By these measures the government only achieved: an underground action of the population instead of a public action. The secret movement soon showed itself in bomb attacks (for instance on the Governor-General during his visit to Djokja), in cane burning, in demolishing the train rails, while nobody could find out who were the authors of the secret conspiracies.

In themselves the bomb-attacks do not amount to much, but when a gentle people such as the Javanese have been up to now start to use such means, then a lot of bitterness and hate must have accumulated. *And this is the red light for the rulers warning them not to proceed.*'

b. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1924, page 73:
'The Indonesian people are too ill with social misery, their conditions of life have been so much threatened and therefore they will grasp with both hands their only rescue. The time will not be far away when poison and dagger, the most powerful and efficient weapon in secret unions, will spread panic and fear, *unless the government understands what is at stake and loosens the reins in time, which it now tries to make as tight as possible.*'

Yesterday the Officer of Justice also quoted in his requisitory this passage to prove that here one is up against 'a rebellion of the worst type'. Is it rebellion, Mr. President, when we say that poison and dagger will spread panic and fear when the government continues in this way. One should again pay full attention to the meaning of the last sentence: *Unless the government understands what is at stake and loosens the reins in time which it now tries to make as tight as possible!*

c. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 7-8, 1924, page 132:
'Everything indicates that one lives in an explosive atmosphere. The contrasts are more and more pronounced, the forces are weighing themselves up against each other in an invisible manner. The underground action works, in spite of all governmental measures, along unknown layers and finally reaches the hearts of the millions who either consciously or intuitively welcome the arrival with an unavoidable collision.'

d. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3-4, 1926, page 63:
'That our people, defenceless as they are, are open to continuous injuries, agitation and provocation, is with such a terrorist regime unavoidable. And if here and there, whether by purposeful revenge or by uncontrolled temper, an accomplice of the government lost his life, it is completely the fault of the foreign ruler.'

e. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1926, page 47:
'These warning signs are not as yet heeded by the government. The conspiracy may have been detected, the leaders or suspected leaders guilty or innocent, may be arrested, but the so-called evil can never be suppressed in this way. The evil does not lie in a population which has become rebellions but in the being of the colonial regime itself and in the methods used to maintain the regime.'

Mr. President, I could quote more passages from *Indonesia Merdeka*, but I think I can suffice with the few I quoted above. One can therefore not say that there have not been enough warnings from our side against the dangers, to which the terrorist measures of the Netherlands East Indian Government and police could not help but lead. We did not only restrict ourselves to warnings, but we even predicted possibilities, that the iron fist policy of the Netherlands East Indian government would not only drive the population movement to underground action, but that it could also result in something terrible, that the buffalo of Sentot 'sick to death of being baited, his horns whetted, throws the cruel driver in the air and flattens him with heavy paw'.

But also here we stood not alone. Even the Netherlands East Indian chronicler of the liberal paper *De Opbouw*[31] at the time, discussing the situation in Indonesia, predicted that in the near future it would come to 'bloody calamities'. How all this has become true!

Then they even bring up the excuse, in order to hide their guilt and lust for power, that Perhimpoenan Indonesia before everything wants underground action.

No, Mr. President, the words quoted by me from the 'Indonesia Merdeka' will cause you to change your point of view. We would be more pleased if we could fight with open visor. The Indonesian population movement would also wish for nothing better. But it is the government itself, which has started sneaky practices. If the result has been that the freedom movement in Indonesia has gone over to underground actions, then the brutal government itself is responsible for this. It is entirely up to them how the national movement will carry out their action. One cannot forcefully and cruelly stop this action, which has been inspired by a noble ideal which also inspires the boader layers of the population because of their growing consciousness.

But has the government of Mr. Fock ever given evidence of wise government policy, of a broad, understanding point of view? Oh no, Mr. President! Because wherever it could, it purposely closed the outlet valve, which on the contarry should be left open to prevent too high a tension in the national steam boiler. The infamous article 161bis of the Netherlands East Indian Penal Code, by which one can commit any arbitrariness of course must be held high at all costs. And so on 1 May 1926 it made two new inventions such as articles 153bis and 153ter, which threatened to choke all political life of the native population. They read as follows:

153bis: 'He who purposely advocates, verbally, in writing or by illustration, indirectly, conditionally or covertly the disturbance of public order or the overthrowing of or attack of the authority in the Netherlands or in the Netherlands East Indies or who tries to influence people to this effect, will be punished with imprisonment of a maximum of six years or a fine of a maximum of three hundred guilders'.

153ter: 'He who distributes, openly exhibits or places in a public place a paper or illustration (with the intent to disclose the contents or to make the contents more publicly known) in which directly, conditionally or covertly the disturbance of the public order or the overthrowing of or attack of the authority in the Netherlands or in the Netherlands East Indies is advocated or by which means people may be influenced to this effect, will be punished with imprisonment of a maximum of five years or a fine of a maximum of three hundred guilders'.

c. *Racial justice in Indonesia*

In themselves those Penal Code clauses such as Art. 161 bis, 153 bis and 153 ter, would not be so bad if when they were applied a wider point of view was taken. In free countries with a democratic parliamentary system, where the *national consciousness* also forms a factor in legislation and where furthermore *jurisprudence* can be created when the legal regulations clash with the general *sense of justice* of society, such provisions would be doomed to oblivion. But not in Indonesia, where only the will of the Government is the deciding factor and where racial discrimination is rampant in all the courts of justice.

How liberal is the Indies Criminal Law really? If someone states in public that the *Plakat Pandjang* has been torn to pieces by bayonets, he gets a sentence of seven months' imprisonment.[32] When someone else says that 'Spain has done more for the Philippines in 100 years than the Netherlands have done for Indonesia in 300', then the law says: I've got you. This is called: 'arousing sentiments of enmity, hate or contempt towards the government of the Dutch East Indies, or at any rate of Holland'.[33]

And we remember vividly the case of the Indonesian woman Wara Ati, which demonstrates the practice of racist law in Indo-

nesia. When she let fall the remark that she would never have a government official for a son-in-law, she was given *a full year's jail sentence* for this crime. I am asking you, Mr. President, what was criminal in this phrase. But for Dutch law in Indonesia such a phrase is quite sufficient for the clauses on sowing hatred to be applied, at any rate to Indonesians. And the case of Wara Ati is certainly not an isolated one. But how does the judicature in Indonesia react to utterances on the part of the Dutch Colonial Community? Yesterday, Mr. Duys demonstrated in his plea in an excellent way how racial justice works,[34] so I may consider myself exempt from enumerating a lot of examples. Nevertheless I would like to quote a few instances. When a certain Dutch journalist called Wybrandts, well known as a past master at abusing people, directed this arrogant remark at Governor-General De Graeff:

'Go away! Clear off! You are a good chap and a man of good will, but the Indies need a stronger hand than yours nowadays!'

– no member of the judicature dared lay a hand on him. This is all the more remarkable as Art. 1, para. 3 of the *Indische Staatsinrichting* states explicitly:

'Everyone in the Netherlands Indies is under an obligation to acknowledge the Governor-General as the King's representative and to respect and obey him as such.'

Let an Indonesian allow himself a similar remark, and the judicature is immediately ready to pronounce on him or her the well-deserved (or rather the *un*deserved) sentence. And a severe one too!

And when an European in Eastern Java shoots down like a dog in cold blood an Indonesian shepherd who took the liberty of having a siesta in his garden and did not get off the white man's property fast enough when told to do so, then he got off scotfree on account of 'ill-treatment with fatal consequences'.

Well, Mr. President, such cases are all too numerous, and we read them regularly in the Indies columns of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, and there is no point in listing them further here.

If this was already the established practice of racial law in Indonesia, one can imagine what a situation was created under the rule of Articles 153 bis and 153 ter, which served to smother alive the local political life. Pleading for a decent existence for the people or pointing out the facts about the reigning colonial system will soon be construed as recommending 'indirectly, conditionally or in covert terms' or as inciting 'the disturbance of public order or

overthrowing or ravishing of the established authority in the Netherlands or the Dutch East Indies'.[35]

d. *Economic and social conditions of the people*

Mr. President! I regret from the bottom of my heart that I have to go against my best interests in having to ask for even more of your attention for problems and conditions in Indonesia during the period of government of Governor-General Fock. I deplore it, but, alas, I cannot do otherwise. Because the facts have made their mark on the attitude and activities of Perhimpoenan Indonesia in its recent period of development. It reacts like a sensitive barometer to economic and political conditions or abuses which exist there.

Having referred to the general political conditions it remains for me to speak about the economic and social conditions of the Indonesian people. As far as the economic conditions are concerned, I have already briefly mentioned that the Indonesian population suffers from *increasing poverty* and is succumbing under the heavy burden of taxation. It now remains for me to illustrate these facts with some figures.

I will leave on one side the various so-called Committees on decreasing prosperity, because they do not serve any purpose. O yes, the Indies Governments feels so much compassion for the Indonesian population that it has already appointed many committees to investigate the causes of decreasing prosperity and many more will be appointed in the future! And the Indonesians ought to be really grateful for this! However, the strength of the Indies Government seems to reside in the appointment of committees to investigate the causes of decreasing prosperity. But not in a purposeful welfare policy! This cannot in the least be expected of the 'economising' government of Mr. Fock. On the contrary, they have continually gnawed at the – economically speaking – wasted body of the Indonesian people.

The latest *report* on the tax burden on the native population of Java and Madoera by Meyer Ranneft-Huender established an impoverishment of the population. The writers have calculated the average family income at *f* 225 per annum. for an average family of 4.9 members this means an average annual income *per head* of the population of a little over *f* 45. For some regions, and in particular for the royal residence of Djokjakarta, it has been established

as a definite fact that the average annual income of the agricultural population per head only amounts to the princely sum of *f* 21.60.[36] From an annual income of *f* 225, from which a family of more than 5 has to be fed, the Indonesian has to pay an average tax of 10%. One may imagine how he is weighed down by it. After having calculated the normal tax burden for the European, Mr. E. P. Wellenstein said in his discussion of the above report in *De Economist* of 1926:[37]

'The conclusion is therefore justified that the native population has to pay *the same percentage* (i.e. 10%) of an average income of *f* 225 as the European with an income of nine to ten thousand guilders. A comparison of the standard of living for an annual income of nine to ten thousand guilders for a European with that *f* 225 for the native population demonstrates convincingly that *in comparison with other population groups the native inhabitants of Java and Madoera are heavily overtaxed.* This conclusion is all the more serious because there is *no* general indication of a decreasing tax burden for the lower incomes of the native population *as there is* for the foreign population.'

One sees what kind of double standards are being applied! It fits in nicely with the philosophy of the colonial system, which is based on the principle that the colonies must support the prosperity of the mother-country, so that the heaviest burden must of necessity fall on the economically weak native population. And on top of that they are lamenting that the Indonesian cannot save money and that he lives from hand to mouth. What on earth can be saved out of so minimal an income from which furthermore a significant part is deducted for various kinds of taxes? It has already been established that the majority of the Indonesian population is *underfed.* But nevertheless overtaxed! Although the *average* tax burden is already heavy, the situation is still more serious if one looks at the agricultural population, who must pay a *ground rent,* a tax in kind, besides other taxes from which they are not exempted. Meyer Ranneft and Huender are compelled in the said report to refer to the *abuses* in Java where people leave their property, because the financial burdens are too heavy. They refer furthermore to cases where the groundrent *only* amounts to more than *twenty* per cent of the gross product, to which is added – in regions such as the Preanger Regencies – another burden of per capita taxes of at least the same amount.

Mr. President, the Indies Government has managed to put a tax burden of at least 40% on this poor population, who can scarcely feed themselves! This then is one of the so-called 'blessings' of the Dutch rule in Indonesia for which the oppressed people must be thankful, oh so thankful. And let no-one say that the groundrent is only levied from the agricultural population. Because almost 90% of the population of Java and Madoera consists of farmers. Furthermore, when one knows that a paddy-field with a yield of 5 pikols of paddy per harvest, i.e. a maximum yield of *f* 40, already comes within the terms of the groundrent, on the understanding that the taxable yield according to the groundrent stipulations varies between 8% and 18%,[38] then it becomes quite clear how heavy the tax burden is for the Indonesian farmer.

In his above-mentioned article in *De Economist* Dr. E. P. Wellenstein says:[39]
'In the report, the heavy over-taxation of the landowner coupled with irregularity of pressure which takes no account of ability to bear them or the method of expenditure, is considered to be one of the greatest evils of the present fiscal system. These evils for the greater part rooted in the land-taxes (land revenue) are made worse by the way the people, often tied to outworn regulations, share the head-money and dessa-taxes between them.'

This then, Mr. Chairman, is the startling conclusion concerning the overtaxation of the Indonesian people particularly the great mass of the peasants!

For more than a century these land-taxes, of foreign origin, have been the greatest canker eating away at the economic situation of the population. And no welfare policy can be taken seriously whose aim is not to abolish this radically. Far from going in this direction, the government of Dr. Fock took the opposite course, and demanded even more tax money from the population.

Dr. Fock wanted to impose the land-taxes also on the West coast of Sumatra – and in the other parts of the Outer Provinces too, if I am not mistaken – where the people had never heard of such things. When the Minangkabauers called public meetings to protest against these taxes, i.e. against further overtaxation of the population – a campaign similar to that of the English against the 'corn-law' in the 19th century – the answer of the Indonesian government was . . . the internment of the leaders. *Indonesia Merdeka* writes:[40]
'The government does not yet realise that an excessive taxation

burden inspite of abominably bad living conditions and rigorous methods of collection, which simply boils down to maltreatment of the population are the factors that will lead to national resistance. For the time being we will leave the further demands such as better education, etc. etc. out of consideration. We will only mention the minimum necessities of life – just enough food, clothes and shelter. The colonial government is not able to provide the Indonesian people with these primitive prerequisites of life. It has always been the mistake of all weak rulers in order to disguise their own impotence to delude themselves that the situation is not so bad, a mistake eventually leading to misgovernment.'

But the extortion machine of Governor-General Fock is still active. Indirect taxes have had to be raised also. Heavy export duties were imposed on native rubber, with the result that competition became more difficult for the Indonesian rubber-planters. Further, the import duties on several articles were raised, which was a heavy burden to the majority of the native population. Even the excise on matches, an article of great importance for the man in the street, was raised. The result was that matches were replaced by flint igniters. However, to save the excise on matches, a very high excise on flints was levied.[41]

In this way, the Fock regime had managed to raise those taxes that were particularly burdensome for the Indonesians, *viz.* the import, export and excise duties, slaughter taxes, land revenue and head-money, from *f* 86.9 million in 1919 tot *f* 173.4 million a year!

However, the same Mr. Fock after sucking the poor *wong-tani* dry, depriving them of all political rights and denying them any protection against political tyranny, was eager to lend a ready ear to the lamentations of the *Council of Employers*, presided over by Mr. Treub, about the 'too heavy tax' on capital.

Mr. Chairman, it is all too obvious that Indonesia is regarded as a place where the white man can become rich with the help of the blood and sweat of the poor Javanese, who has to pay large sums of money into the bargain, in order to provide enough means to maintain the 'order and peace' of the white masters and to guarantee the safety of their plantations and other properties!

When in this unbearable economic situation the discontent and bitterness among the people increased, the government still had the nerve to ascribe this to 'Communist instigation'. The Indonesian correspondent of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* had repeatedly demonstrated during the Fock regime that the growing discontent

and bitterness were not caused by Communism, but that the rapid growth and increasing popularity of the P.K.I. are due to the economic misery of the people. The Government confused cause and effect, to clear itself from any guilt.

If, as a result of those untenable abuses the population of West Java revolted against this tyranny, the Government had an excellent opportunity to ease its conscience by holding the 'Communist agitators' responsible. Of course, Communists did take part in the revolt, but the cause is deeper: it is the tyranny of the government and the economic *Verelendung* of the population. If this was not the cause, why would the government proceed to partial or total remission of taxes in Bantam? In a speech delivered in Rotterdam, Dr. Cramer, a member of the Chamber, also ascribed the cause of this revolt to economic misery. However, much as he deplored the fact, he had to admit that the people revolted because there was no other possibility. Without economic misery and tyranny, the revolt would never have happened.

The popular resistance on the West Coast of Sumatra is also mainly due to *misgovernment*. In well-documented articles, published in *Het Volk* in the course of 1926, the ex-resident Le Febvre, who has a thorough knowledge of the West Coast of Sumatra, warned the government several times against possible consequences of the policy pursued there. His prophecies came true!

It is common knowledge that this revolt had been forced by the lieutenant assistant resident Karsen, a government official who was originally a military man. Plenty of similar cases of provocation are to be found in colonial history. By forcing the population to rebel against the authorities, the latter are enabled to hit out freely. By 'bravely' oppressing the resistance people hope to make a career and acquire orders of knighthood. And, Mr. Chairman, for rulers of this mentality the whole colonial society is not much more than a hunting-ground on which to achieve fame and make a career.

Mr. Chairman, I will leave this subject now but I will go on to discuss briefly the social conditions of the Indonesian people.

I will not waste many words on the lamentable state of popular education. After more than three centuries of colonial domination, the so-called 'apostle of civilisation' had not managed to make the number of literates higher than 7 per cent. Nevertheless the Fock regime decided to economise the Exchequer that the school fees for the native elementary schools were also raised. Consequently those parents who, because of the heavy taxes had hardly enough money

left to support their families, were obliged to take their children from school and leave them without any education. Can anything be worse than this?

Mr. Chairman, I will not talk about the medical care for the Indonesian people, who are subject to all kinds of diseases. The six volumes of *Kromo Blanda*, written by the well-known Mr. H. H. Tillema, are one long complaint against the shameful neglect of the national health by the Netherland Indies Government.

However, I do wish to say a few words about labour conditions in Indonesia. Though I will not discuss the system of the Penal Sanction, I must mention the social evils which prevail, and have prevailed during and beyond that system. Especially during the government of Dr. Fock! How often did we read in the newspapers about the shocking ill-treatment of the coolies. The Poeloe Mandi affair on the East Cost of Sumatra is one of the most striking examples of criminal actions by private employers against the coolies. These people were forced into working in a way which defies description. Not even animals would be treated like that. We can read about this horrible spectacle in the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* of 7th and 24th November, 1926. People were punished daily, they were beaten with rattan, deprived of their freedom, undressed and tarred, threatened with death to prevent them from telling about the maltreatments. Those who had tried to escape these barbaric punishments, if caught, were compelled to eat the excrement of horses and men.[42] If they refused they were tortured to death.

Mr. Chairman, if you cannot believe this, I ask you to read the *N.R.C.* of 7th and 24th November, 1926 in which these barbarities were described in detail. In the enlightened twentieth century, this reign of terror and devilish cunning still exists in a colony that 'is ruled by Holland in such an excellent way', as it is said.

Must we be silent, Mr. Chairman, when we read in the newspapers what beastly methods the so-called 'civilised' men use to maltreat our defenceless people? Oh, the tragedy of an oppressed country! I would like to ask the Public Prosecutor who considers our writings so criminal, what qualification he knows for these crimes. Whether he, daring to demand such extravagant sentences, can think of better punishments than his colleagues in Indonesia!

Examples of similar maltreatment of coolies are numerous on the plantations, inter alia – on Soeban Ajam (Benkoelen), Aer Taman (Palembang), Sebatoe (Langkat) in the Siantarse district. The In-

donesian government has not yet found an adequate method to put an end to these mediaeval barbarities. The punishments which these unscrupulous, power-craving 'culture' people underwent, were far too light to be able to combat these maltreatments conclusively.[43]

But there is more, Mr. Chairman!

In the twentieth century we witness barbaric punishments such as beatings with rattan, practised by the Netherlands, a country that pretends to be a first-rate colonial power. In this enlightened twentieth century the defenceless Indonesian prisoners and contract labourers underwent the same punishments as were inflicted on the Christian martyrs only in the days of Rome. The white man in the colony does not have any sense of justice and humanity. 'If silent time could speak to how many revolting scenes would it have borne witness during the Dutch government of Indonesia! The rattan punishment . . . one of the many 'blessings' Holland, the country of 'civilisation' and of 'justice' has brought to the millions of Indonesian people . . . the tragedy'![44]

Knowing that this mediaeval barbaric punishment was defended by a former member of the Judiciary in the Netherlands Indies, Dr. W. K. S. van Haastert, who, in *De Telegraaf* of 20th December, 1925, declared on behalf of many former visitors to the Indies that this punishment was indispensable in the Dutch colonies for the time being, one realises how 'Justice' operated in Indonesia and what some members of the Judiciary meant by 'Justice'.

We are absolutely fed up with this kind of 'Dutch civilisation', demonstrated in such a 'brave' way by those who call themselves exponents of Dutch culture. I do not feel any desire to say more about this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conclude this part of my speech without saying a few words about *protection of the workers*. Holland, which has always been proud of its social legislation, fails everywhere in its colonies to protect the employees against inhuman exploitation by the employers. During the Fock regime there was still *child labour*, particularly on the tobacco plantations. Not only children of 12-16 years old helped to string the tobacco-leaves, but also children *under* 12 were exploited. There is no social legislation in Indonesia, forbidding these abuses. Don't say, as the Indonesian chronicler of *De Economist* did,[45] that child labour is indispensable because there are not enough adult labourers. It is difficult to believe that there would be a shortage of adult labourers on an overpopulated island like Java. But the thing is that the creditors on the

Western beaches would begin to grumble, if they had to pay higher wages in order to attract more labourers to their plantations. Female and child labour is cheaper, isn't it!

The argument that a social legislation of Western origin is not suitable for an Eastern colony is also wrong. Yes, Mr. Chairman, where legislation protecting the economically weak native labourers against exploitation by capitalist employers is concerned, it is very easy to find a ban: *down with social legislation*; the situation is different when the state of high dividens *has* to be maintained; then protection is necessary. Then it is: 'Long live Penal Sanctions', 'Up with Article 161 bis'!

But enough about this.

Mr. Chairman, I needed some time to illustrate the 'blessings' of the Fock government. I hope that I have succeeded in indicating how this gentleman, in his efforts to make the budget balance, did not respect the most vital interests of the Indonesian people, whereas he lacked the nerve to exert the same severity on the Dutch group in Indonesia. Beside economic and social misery, the population suffered also from overtaxation. If, consequently, the discontent and bitterness among the people increased, Mr. Fock knew no other remedy than tyrannical oppression. Thus his despotic government created the underground action that ended in a bloody drama in West Java and the West Coast of Sumatra. Eventually the Communists had to pay for it. Two sentences are enough to describe Dr. Fock's policy: Symen pays! Barbertje must hang!

Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the Indonesian Symens had nothing left to pay the Dutch Shylock with but their own pounds of flesh, then the Communist Barbertjes had to hang, to satisfy the Dutch 'sense of justice' and cold-bloodedness. Then Upper Digoel with its marshes had to be populated with those so-called 'Communist agitators'. This waste land may still be brought under crops thanks to the sweat of these poor martyrs, and become a safe place for European investments. Isn't that what colonial property is for!

Mr. Chairman! Such is the development of the political, economic and social conditions in Indonesia, since the famous November promise of 1918. Instead of participation in the ruling of the country and other political rights, as promised by the Dutch government at the time, the Indonesian people enjoyed even less freedom, together with increasing pauperisation and social evils. How mean is the contrast!

In spite of all this they are still surprised when the Indonesian

students in Holland react against such abuses in their native country. They cannot understand that their hearts are bleeding because of the sufferings of their countrymen to whom they have entrusted their desires, expectations and love. They cannot imagine that the sufferings, inflicted upon their countrymen are their sufferings too. These wounds hurt even more, since they now realise themselves the meaning of *Freedom* and the value of *justice* in the country of Hugo Grotius. They learn what 'self-determination' means; and they must understand even better what it is like 'to be dependent on a foreing nation'.

The Dutch people of the 20th century have always been free. Therefore, it is very difficult for them to imagine in what conditions their own ancestors in the 15th and 17th centuries or in the days of Napoleon lived when they groaned under foreign rule. If they could imagine this situation, they would understand the feelings of the Indonesian students. But unfortunately, they do not understand them!

As the mountaineer, at the top of a hill, has better view of the landscape than the people who live in that landscape, so the Indonesian students in Holland are in a better position to take a view of the cononial situation than their countrymen, who live under the colonial hypnosis. They learn from experience what it means to 'have faith in the oppressor'. The November promise of 1918 was not made for the love of Indonesia, but merely under the stress of circumstances of the revolutionary disturbances of that time. They have learnt that anything Indonesia achieved had to be extorted from the oppressor.

Faith in the good intentions of the oppressor appeared to be misplaced, in the framework of modern politics. Only bitter experience teaches this. Thus *Indonesia Merdeka* following the development of the Indonesian national movement finds:

'At first only a few timid voices expressed faith in the integrity of the government. People expected the government to inspire and guide them in fulfilling their budding desires. Under the guidance of the government they wanted to step out into the future. We will only mention the repeated assurances of the Sarikat Islam leaders during the S.I. congıesses. Nor solely confidence in the sincerity of the oppressor's intentions but probably also the feeling of their own impotence caused them to seek support from the government. This feeling of their impotence was the result of the perpetual emphasis on our inferiority and the excellent qualities of the West.

As the years wore on and the Indonesian people caught the ruler out in more and more lies, as one promise after another was violated, public opinion changed. A feeling of distrust stole in upon them. They suspected bad faith, but blamed only those who held the reins of government. Then they set their hopes on the Dutch parliament; they expected it to step into the breach for Indonesia and to vote for Indonesia's rightful claims and wishes, if only it were acquainted with Indonesia's distress. But they were soon disappointed again. In their naivety they had set their hopes too high.'[46]

Perhimpoenan Indonesia, which occupied itself with analysing the colonial situation and came to a better realisation of the discrepancy between the *promises* made in November, 1918 and their 'fulfilment' à la Fock came to the firm conviction that one must not expect help and support from the oppressor for the freedom of one's own Fatherland, but that one must *rely on oneself only*. Serving as the 'political barometer' of the events in Indonesia, it agitated against Dr. Fock's policy in that country. I hope that, being better acquainted with the Fock regime, one can understand and appreciate the campaign of Perhimpoenan Indonesia.

5. PERHIMPOENAN INDONESIA: ITS PRINCIPLES AND THEIR GROUNDS

Mr. Chairman! As I have already explained, the new orientation of Perhimpoenan Indonesia begins with the acceptance of the *non-cooperation principle*. Thus it learns to appeal again and again to the big heart of the Dutch nation. It gave up the bad habit of the 'outstretched hand', of begging favours of other people. From now on it wants a policy of reliance on its own power, on itself. It wants to drum this feeling of *self-respect* into the heads of the Indonesian people. For 'a nation that has shaken off the feeling of dependence has no fear of the future. For a nation that knows its own worth, the horizons are bright'.[47]

Perhimpoenan Indonesia wants to educate its own people itself and make them powerful. Indonesia Merdeka remarks:

'The domination has had a disorganising effect on Indonesian life and suffocated its vitality. All sources of national prosperity became choked up. The intellectual structure of the nation has been changed. Its personality is temporarily broken.

In educating the nation we have to give it back its personality. But how does one achieve this? Not through cooperating with the oppressor. The element of self-confidence is not switched on by using a mediator, but only *directly*, without any help from outside. Only by making our people conscious of their capacities. Our people have to *know* that they are capable of great achievements themselves. Their latent powers have to be revealed. Though it is important to remind them of the glorious past, the main thing is to stimulate them to action.'[48]

The popularity of Perhimpoenan Indonesia among the Indonesian people, particularly among the Indonesian intellectuals, is chiefly due to the way it *conceived* the non-cooperation principle. While the non-cooperation movement in Indonesia was originally only a *protest* against the violation of the November promise and the government's neglect of the most vital interests of the population, Perhimpoenan Indonesia grasped it immediately as an *essential* element of Indonesia's fight for freedom. Embittered by the experiences with the Indonesian Union and knowing that a colonial situation is governed by the conflicting interests of the oppressor and the oppressed, it understood that Indonesia's strivings for independence could not be achieved by a policy of cooperation. According to *Indonesia Merdeka*:

'Cooperation is only possible between two groups that have the *same rights* and *obligations* and, furthermore, *common interest*. When this condition is not fulfilled, cooperation merely means that the stronger party bullies the weaker, using the latter as an instrument to support its own interests.'[49]

In the context of present colonial relations, a policy of cooperation only creates hesitation and a lack of self-confidence amongst the subject people.[50]

If the non-cooperation movement in Indonesia was originally a pure copy of the Gandhian type, Perhimpoenam Indonesia merely advocates it as an unavoidable *negative* aspect of its *active* policy of self-help. It is the *positive* side which is dominant, and not the *negative* reverse to which it is do inseparably linked. This concept was first formulated in the Committee's programme of principles drawn up in 1923. It would therefore be entirely wrong to allege that our non-cooperation is the means of expression of a disheartened nation. On the contrary, 'it is the manifestation of a nation with faith in itself and conscious of the fresh, youthful strength it feels surging up within it.'[51]

It is *this* policy of *auto-activity* and therefore *not a mendicant policy* that Perhimpoenan Indonesia has made every effort to advocate and which is gradually becoming accepted amongst the Indonesian nationalist parties at home. According to the interview given by the *Sarikat Islam* leader H. A. Salim in *De Locomotief*, this movement too is beginning to regard non-cooperation as self-help since it has become convinced that 'colonial society offers little place for sentiment and humanitarian tendencies, but is governed on the basis of facts and figures.'

And the pointlessness of the policy of cooperation was shown clearly enough by the present author in an article on *The Indonesian Mock Parliament!* in *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1924, page 23: 'As long as there is no wide franchise to guarantee our people's influence on the representative body, and as long as that body is not given a truly representative character, all its work will be fruitless and an irresponsible waste of the nation's time.'

One cannot refute this argument by pointing to the S.D.A.P. which initially occupied a single seat in Parliament but gradually, by stubborn cooperation, managed to gain twenty-four. Despite the fact that it still constitutes a minority, the S.D.A.P. has never contemplated introducing a policy of non-cooperation. This does not lead to the conclusion that our non-cooperation is unwise – the comparison simply is not valid.

The S.D.A.P. has a long-term goal; its aim is to bring about a change in the existing social order. But above all, it operates on national soil, in a free country, where the principles of self-determination of a free nation finds expression, a principle which, according to Kranenburg, is guaranteed by Article 110 of the Constitution. The exercise of legislative power by Parliament here 'tends to express and realise the nation's living sense of justice'.[52] When Minister Cort Van Der Linden defended his plan for universal suffrage, he pointed out that this must necessarily form the basis for 'the representation of the *political consciousness and sense of justice of the masses*'.

In this country a political party can, through its numerical strength, exercise a proportionate influence on the process of legislation. The S.D.A.P. is assured of this influence because of the system of proportional representation. It therefore does not have the slightest reason to withdraw from parliamentary activity or to conduct a policy of non-cooperation.

This is not so in Indonesia, where the principle of self-determi-

nation belonging to a free nation is non-existent and where the people, despite the so-called National Council, do not have the slightest influence on the process of government. *Indonesia Merdeka* rightly claims:

'The setting up of the National Council was no more than a means of keeping the children quiet. This is quite obvious from the powers it has been given. Indonesia has let itself be fooled.'[53]

In a colonial society everything is based on power relations. In a subject country the only one to have 'the law' on his side is the ruling power. People who would claim that the law is 'the primary set of rules everyone should follow' may well be asked, 'How are those rules created, how are they fixed?' The answer is that they are simply and unilaterally decreed by the ruling power with no regard for the sentiments or desires of the subject population. The latter should accept the will imposed from above whether they wish to or not, for the iron fist is concealed within it.[54]

Indonesia Merdeka rightly states:

'In subject countries justice and the law are merely cheap phrases colonisers like to dress up in when appearing before an international audience. Off-stage they sing a different tune. What hypocrisy!'[55]

This is the difference! In a modern constitutional state the law is the generally live sense of justice rooted in the consciousness of a nation. In a colony the law is, as Stirner calls it, the *brute force* of *authority*. One need only remember Governor General Fock's penal clauses to appreciate the truth of that. Their justice is never questioned. *Force* alone is decisive. An honest writer like Romain Rolland can therefore write:

'Il y a un demi-siècle, la Force *primait* le Droit. Aujourd'hui c'est bien pire: la Force *est* le Droit. Elle l'a dévoré'.[56]

Therein lies the explanation why the Indonesian people, or at least its representatives, cannot, as a matter of principle, take part in a so-called parliament like the National Council. Any comparison with parliamentary action in a free country like the Netherlands simply cannot hold. The Indonesians consequently have a better, more *appropriate* name for this kind of parliament which was presented to them as a *Dewan Rajat* (People's Council). By changing the last letter, they simply call it a *Dewan Rajap*, or council of white ants, in other words a council of destroyers.

It is part of the nature of a colonial relationship that only the *will* of the ruler is held to be 'justice'. Therefore everything is based on power, for as soon as one grants a colony the principle of

self-determination, the colonial relationship itself would be at an end. Salvation consists of setting one nation over another!

The *exorbitant powers* of the Governor General are a typical example of '*colonial* justice'. About this *Indonesia Merdeka* writes: 'From a legal point of view they are unjustifiable; it is outrageous that a person's liberty can be infringed without his having contravened any clause in the Penal Code. Under the present social order law and order is maintained solely by invoking the *Penal Code.* The Government in Indonesia is so confident of its own total authority that in addition to the very wide powers of the penal clauses, it still feels the Special Regulations should also be retained.'[57]

A typical example of the way in which these Regulations are manipulated is quoted by Professor Kleintjes in his standard work: 'In respect of the native and equivalent populations, the temptation is frequently great to make use of the means available to the Government under Article 47 of the Government Regulations instead of resorting to criminal proceedings. It has also occurred that persons suspected of committing a punishable offence were interned even after they had been acquitted by the competent Judge for lack of evidence. Several natives suspected of taking part in the serious Tjilegon disorders of July 1888 were dealt with in this manner'.[58]

The so-called right of defence of a person who is to be interned is simply a *formality* and *no* safeguard, as the Government Regulations intended it to be under Article 48. 'A mere examination, usually upon points in questions where the dominant position of Authority is displayed to the person to be removed . . . cannot claim to be designated as a defence'.[59]

The practice of recent years has shown us that usually there is not even any question of an 'examination! The persons to be interned were simply given a sheet of *hectographed* questions with a series of *hectographed* answers which had been made to fit them willy-nilly and without their knowledge. Those who refused to sign the hectographed paper were beaten up and starved until, wearying of their torment, they put their signatures to the *document.*[60]

This, Mr. President, is further evidence that for the Colonial Government, even a *guarantee* given *by law* no longer has any meaning. This is what 'Justice' means in a colony, this is the application of the 'Law' in a country under colonial rule. The Laws merely represent so much waste paper if they happen to be to the disadvantage of those in authority.

In my *Economic World Structure and the Conflict of Power*[61] I

have tried to examine the nature of the colonial problem and I reached the conclusion that the colonial *relationship* depends on whether and to what degree the mother country is dependent on the produce and minerals of the colony. In those cases where at the present time this dependence is an established fact one cannot expect *true* self-government for the exploited colony. And practice has shown that where the people are said to have autonomy, this is actually a *sham* self-government, at any rate it is not one of the kind known in the British Dominions. In outline those so-called autonomies can be divided into three main groups.

Firstly:

If the colony has a 'Representative' body it is the preponderance of the *white* element in that body that matters most. This can easily be arranged through the electoral system. The ruler's will prevails.

Secondly:

Where the 'representative' body consists exclusively of native persons we see that in this case care is taken that the majority of its members should be *civil servants* who, when required, are obliged to vote for the official proposals. Here too the will of the ruler prevails but the deception is greater than in the first case.

Thirdly:

If the 'representative' body consists exclusively of native persons with a possible majority of *non*-civil servants that body is reduced to a mere advisory council. When nevertheless it is called a legislative body one has to take into account the unlimited right to veto of the white Governor-General. And even if the colony has a system like that in the Philippines where the Governor-General's veto can be annulled by a further vote of the representative body, the governor may appeal to the Head of Government of the mother country, which in the case of the Philippines is the President of the United States, who will take care that the interests of the mother country are not harmed. Here too the will of the rulers finds expression in an indirect way.[62]

A colonial self-government like that in the British Dominions will not be possible for the exploited colony. The former is a settlement by emigrants with a colonial population of the same race as the ruling nation. Here blood-ties play a role in the relationship between the mother country and the colony. If it comes to it the colony will always take the side of the mother country, and there is no question of the colony breaking away from the mother country.

The granting of as generous an autonomy as possible greatly helps to maintain the political ties.

Things are different in the exploited colony where the native colonial population is of quite a different race from the ruling nation. The colonial relationship for the former is one of humiliation and above all she wants to be free from the mother country. She has not the least interest in maintaining the existing political ties.

Where the colonial relationship is governed by the material dependence of the ruling nation on the colony, it is understandable that the mother country is not at all interested in *real* self-government for the colony. It knows only too well that it would be easy for the colony to break away from the mother country once it has obtained autonomy. Hence the relationship shows a *power* contrast resulting from a conflict of interests. After all everything hinges here on the position of power of the ruling nation. Above all the latter will see to it that it is *its* will which prevails. Mr. Stokvis was quite right at the time when he realised that the colonial government is the keeper of the white capitalists.

Mr. President, Perhimpoenan Indonesia has no longer any illusions that Indonesia will ever freely obtain autonomy from the Netherlands. Hence the acceptance of the non-co-operation principle which is only a very negative side of its positive policy of self-industry. The correctness of this principle is all the more confirmed by the attitude of the Netherlands in the way it thinks it can acquit itself of the November Promise. The result of the *parliamentary debates* about the Law on the form of government in the Dutch East Indies leaves no doubt as to the *real* intentions of the Netherlands. Under the guise of 'Immaturity' and 'Gradual development' are the real policies which are only too readily influenced by whisperings of the demon of *selfishness* and *covetousness* which is the *Leitmotiv* of Dutch colonial statemanship. Unfortunately, Mr. President, I have not available in my cell the Minutes of the States General concerning the said colonial debates of 1925 which decided the present form of government in the Dutch East Indies. I should have preferred to substantiate my arguments with extensive quotations of the various statements by *right wing* and *liberal* spokesmen that show those selfish attitudes so clearly. They might have made a more reasoned allegation possible. Meanwhile, Mr. President and honourable Judges, I do not wish to underestimate your own knowledge and I trust that you are not altogether ignorant of the facts.

However, in order to give some positive weight to my allegations I shall quote a few statements which I do have in my possession. They are quotations that show in the clearest possible way, the selfish character of Dutch colonial policies!

On the occasion of the discussions in the Lower House in 1919 about a couple of motions concerning the abolition of the exorbitant rights, the reporting commission remarked in its Provisional Report that it:

'(expressed) the general feeling that the relationship of the Netherlands with its colonies are of quite a different nature than that of powerful Britain towards its Indian realm . . . The British colonial system has grown into *intentional training for independence.*[63] Such a system does not suit the Netherlands as long as we need the direct and indirect benefits that at present are obtained from the Dutch East Indies.'[64] This statement, shared by the greater majority of the Lower House, leaves no room for doubt! No more is it ambiguous about the real intentions of the Netherlands with regard to Indonesia. Direct and indirect benefits from the colony – those are the roots of the desire of the Netherlands to remain in power in Indonesia. Later came a statement from Mr. De Graaff the Minister, in the Upper House on 25th March 1925, and I am quoting the report in the morning issue of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* of 27th March 1925:[65]

'Not a single measure aimed at releasing the East Indies from the Netherlands will receive his support . . . Intellectually and socially he wants to develop the Indies within the sphere of the Dutch State.'

This statement too is as clear as crystal. And it should be remembered that an official statement has the support of a good seventy percent of the Dutch Parliament.

Indonesia Merdeka added the following to Mr. De Graaff's statement:

'This indicates the limits to which our development and education is permitted to go. Certainly Indonesia is allowed to develop, intellectually and socially, but it must not interfere with Dutch interests. Development has to proceed along precisely defined lines and has to be stopped or slowed down as soon as it departs from its narrow course. The starting point, therefore, is not what intellectual and social education is demanded by Indonesia's development but one rather moulds that education to preconceived ideas that Indonesia must remain a department of Messrs. Holland.'[66]

Only considerations of understandable self-interest led to the

acceptance of the amendments by Mr. Feber and his party which introduces into the form of government for the East Indies the clause that the majority of the members of the National Council must be Dutchmen. This Dutch majority is needed to maintain the Dutch position of power in a quasi-legal manner. When a purely Dutch interest has been promoted by means of that National Council it has also the psychological advantage of being able to be used in defence to explain that this is what 'their' representatives wished. What hypocrisy!

If Mr. De Graaff's tinkering is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, the amendment by Mr. Feber and his party is all the more so! Experts on Indonesian constitutional law like Prof. Van Vollenhoven, Prof. Kleintjes and Prof. Carpentier Alting have indeed repeatedly exposed this disparity with the spirit of the constitution.

But let us dwell, for the time being, on the official utterances in the Chamber proper regarding the future of the National Council. Already during the discussion of the *Law of 16th December 1916,* during which the tenth chapter of the Government Regulations was inserted, the then Minister of the Colonies, Mr. Pleyte, named in his Memorandum of Reply the native population as the party most immediately concerned, and with whom the new future would have to be approached.

But was this official pronouncement observed? Why no, Mr. President! For at the same time as this declaration was made, there was revealed a great gap between words and deeds, which caused Mr. Mendels to make the following remark:

'What we are offering here is deplorably, most deplorably little. What we are offering here has nothing to do with the right of participation of the native population in co-determining their own interests.'[67]

And yet, it had been officially said that the Indonesian population is the most immediately concerned party! What was achieved in 1925 also conflicted directly with this thought. But that is the way of *politics*! What does it care whether or not its creations are in conflict with the Constitution, or what had been advised or promised previously. What counts is *how* the Netherlands interests can best be served at any given moment. In the given circumstances nothing better could be done than to have the Dutch majority in the National Council rooted in advance in the law. For, if an Indonesian majority in the National Council were created, this would certainly have its repercussions upon the composition of the East

Indies budget. Then, for example, more monies would be earmarked for looking after native education, public health etc. and fewer funds for unproductive expenditures such as the cost of the Army and the Navy. Then, for instance, measures would be taken to reduce the taxes of the Indonesians and conversely increasing those of European businessmen, so as to balance the general tax level. And that of course might be a danger to the peace and quiet of those drawing the profit on Western Shores! Then the Indonesian government could make use of its veto to undo such National Council decisions, but it is of course understood that this can only lead to the occurrence of an increased psychological conflict between the authorities and the people.

It is curious to note how deeply rooted is the fear of the Dutch legislative authorities of a possible harming of Dutch interests when the National Council has an Indonesian majority. Most curious, Mr. President, for those who know the defective colonial electoral system need not have any fear of this. For in the existing system such an Indonesian majority would consist for its major part of the 'servants of the powers that be' who, if it came to the crunch, would be obliged to vote for the government anyhow. In this respect it is only of importance to us Indonesians to know to what an extent Dutch egotism and self-interest govern the colonial policy!

Where there is thus a question here of a conflict of interest between ruler and ruled, the continuous *predominance* of the ruler in the colony has to be assured. Looked at from the egotistical Dutch viewpoint, one can understand the basic tenet of their colonial policy, not to allow any measure which might weaken this position of power in respect of the Indonesian population. And only too often this egotistical motive is hidden behind the mask of 'gradual development' and 'Indonesia not ripe for self-government'. Yes, Mr. President, now, I mean in 1925, they started to talk about 'gradualness', about 'immaturity' and so on, but in the November days of 1918, when they were frightened, it was not claimed that 'too fast a development is fatal for the East Indies themselves'. Yes, at that time they talked about the *necessity* of 'thorough reforms of the public institutions in the light of new principles'. There was no talk of 'gradual development', as now, but of 'a faster tempo, so that much of what had initially been deemed obtainable only in a distant future will now come within easier grasp'. There was no talk then about 'immaturity', on the contrary, it

was then said that 'the government accepts the consequences, resulting from the pressure exerted in the colonies by leading groups, that the new directions followed in the Netherlands should also be followed there'.[68]

And now, when they again hold absolute power, Indonesia is again to be too immature for self-government!

But an unprejudiced observer will undoubtedly find the opposite to be true. Not that Indonesia is not ready for self-government, but *that the Netherlands are not yet ready* to educate a colony such as Indonesia for independence. That which the United States managed to accomplish for the Philippines in eighteen years, the Dutch were unable to even approach from afar in over three centuries. Yes, Mr. President, they are even shameless enough to deduce the immaturity of Indonesia from the fact that Indonesia still has 93% of illiterates. And is it perhaps the Indonesian people's own fault that they still have so many illiterates? No, Mr. President, to any clear thinking person this fact is proof that the Netherlands, because of their egotism and covetousness, cannot afford the luxury of education a populace. This fact is damning judgment of Dutch colonial policy! But, above all, must Indonesia wait until the last peasant in the last desa receives education from a government institution to be ready for self-government? In that case, Indonesia must wait a very long time.

No, Mr. President, the suitability of a people for self-government does not depend on the number of illiterates, but in the first place on its democratic institutions and on the persuasion of its intellectuals. Indonesia can satisfy both these demands!

The slogan of immaturity is a fiction to soothe a gnawing conscience, to cover self-interest and egotism. On what is this allegation based? Has it ever been tested? But, if one looks around in the world and starts making comparisons, one could easily ask oneself: why are countries like Liberia, Abyssinia, Hedjaz, Yemen, etc. which culturally and intellectually certainly rank behind Indonesia then ready for self-government?

Yes, Mr. President, they are even independent and sovereign countries. Is the reason perhaps that their deserts cannot produce oil, or tobacco, or sugar, etc? It is clear now that the presence of rich natural resources and the wealth of agricultural produce are responsible for the branding of Indonesia as *immature* for *self-government*.

The desire to obtain the greatest possible advantages, directly

or indirectly, from Indonesia has caused the Netherlands to follow a colonial policy whose main guidelines are determined by the thought of how to maintain Dutch predominance in the face of the growing consciousness of the Indonesian people.

Hence the policy in which on the one hand a *pretence* is made of consenting to the desires of the colonial population, whilst on the other hand making certain that *superiority* remains on the side of the white ruler. His position of power must be maintained at any price. In reality, the Indonesian population has hardly any political rights; it has furthermore no protection against the excesses of lust for power of white officials suffering from tropical distemper. The Indonesian is more or less tolerated as a necessary evil. Albert Sarraut described this so precisely:

'The native, black or yellow, is less a man than an instrument for work, valid only whilst he is able to serve and thrown out once he is broken. What is the use of educating him, teaching him, perfecting him, trying to raise him to one's own level, when it is accepted that his origin, or the colour of his skin, predestine him to the eternal servitude of inferior races. Why even spare him, take care of him or his children, take care of the conservation of his race, when his natural proliferation will automatically take care of replenishing the gaps caused in the "herd" by illness, epidemics, physiological misery or over-exertion through the tasks imposed? The good offices of a more or less generous "charity" will suffice, as far as he is concerned, to discharge any humanitarian duties.'[69]

These ironical words by Albert Sarraut fit in completely at the end of all I have said about the manner in which the Netherlands has looked after the most vital interests of the Indonesian population, in which it acts arbitrarily in Indonesia, and in which it still tolerates mediaevally barbaric torture of the natives, and finally with the Dutch colonial ideal that Indonesia must eternally remain 'a great coffee and sugar plantation for the State'!

Mr. President! Following the 1925 debates in the Chamber *Perhimpoenan Indonesia* no longer has the least doubts about the *real* intentions of the tyrant. That is why it can only be *suspicious* about the so-called 'good' intentions of the Netherlands.

In this suspicion lies the origin of its *principle of non-cooperation* and at the same time its principle of justice. It sees the salvation of its own national existence as possible only through its own strength and knowhow. To appeal to the sense of justice of the ruler is absurd, since he is based on the principle of *power*. Where justice

in the purest sense of the word cannot be expected in the colonial society, the *policy of cooperation* is an expression of *impotence.* He who senses this impotency inside himself must not desire freedom, the way world order is arranged. For, as Dr. Jan Romein says:

'Love of freedom causes rebellion, compels to resistance against what exists, for freedom has to be conquered; it always flees behind the walls of the reigning present, which must be demolished so as to be able to get it.'[70]

Perhimpoenan Indonesia now realises more than ever that the problem of national liberty is a *power problem.* A change in the colonial conditions can only be caused by the posing of a *power question.*

To arrive at this, the first requirement is a *mass action,* hence a formation of power, to be attained successively by means of propaganda for Indonesian *unity* and *solidarity,* for *confidence* and *self-consciousness.*

This *basic thought* was expressed for the first time in the first two theses of the *declaration of principles* of the 1924 government: 'Only an Indonesia that feels united and disregards differences among the various groups can break the power of the tyranny. The common goal – the liberation of Indonesia – demands the creation of self-conscious nationalistic mass-actions, relying on their own power.

With regard to this, *Indonesia Merdeka* notes:

'We meet organisation with organisation, power with our own power. Those Indonesians who have finished their studies must join the struggling masses. For too long the intellectuals have ignored this and ever louder are the reproaches from the Fatherland that most of the returned graduates have ignored the fate of the suffering masses. "A fully Indonesian parliament is impossible, because a parliament is the organised popular will, which does not exist in the East Indies, since the population is politically immature" – thus the government reply to the Committee Report of the National Council regarding the project for revision of the frame of government of the Dutch East Indies. Well then, we shall comply with this invitation to formulate an "organised popular will". The third point of the present programme of principles ties in well with this: . . . a preparation for political independence.'[71]

By premising that the intellectuals must join the masses, Perhimpoenan Indonesia has understood its calling better than Boedi Oetomo which above all wishes to remain a Society of Javanese intellectuals. Because without the masses a liberation movement

cannot start anything and the real popular lies inside the masses.

Thus *Indonesia Merdeka* declares:

'The determining factor in the national liberation struggle does not lie within the small group of intellectuals. The heart of the nation beats inside the broad layers. The intellectuals only need to find out this effervescent, fresh popular power and interpret it. Its heart is open to receive the voice of the time.'[72]

Perhimpoenan Indonesia, owing to its clearly stated principles, enjoys the confidence of its people and has contributed much towards removing the wrath of the masses against the intellectuals, of whom they assumed until recently that they would let their own welfare and the interests of their own class prevail.[73] This confidence of the masses is of very great value to Perhimpoenan Indonesia. Because only in this case is it sufficiently morally armed to be able to lead the masses, to arrive at an organised popular will.

6. THE ACTIONS OF PERHIMPOENAN INDONESIA

Mr. President! I now come to the *actions* of *Perhimpoenan Indonesia*. Following the explanation of its principles, it has now become clear that, in its preparations for the independence of Indonesia, it is following a policy leading directly to this goal. It does not wish to tread any further side-paths, which can only lead to increased bitterness.

Farewell to the policy of pleading and praying!

Goodbye to the policy of begging for favours!

Adieu to the policy of the outstretched hand!

Perhimpoenan Indonesia is fully convinced that only action based on the principle of *non-cooperation* has the power to restore to the Indonesian people their *self-confidence*, and to stimulate their *political awareness*.

Since the acquisition of national liberty is essentially a *power question* and since the national liberation movement finds itself constantly confronted with the power position of the ruler, the first point to determine is of what this power position consists, and on what it is based. Perhimpoenan Indonesia has therefore made it its first task to investigate this power position. It has found that this power position rests on two different factors. Besides the *actual* power of the white arms and their having at their disposal ready army, which cannot be arbitrarily attacked, there exist various

psychological factors of power on which the authority and prestige of the ruler rest. It is these power factors which in the very first place will have to be systematically undermined, one after the other. They principally consist of:

a. *Divide-and-rule policy*;
b. *Keeping the masses ignorant*;
c. *Psychological injection of the idea of superiority of the white race and of the unassailability of its position: injection of the idea of national impotence of the Indonesians*;
d. *Association-policy.*

Perhimpoenan Indonesia fully realises that once these psychological power factors, on which the prestige of the rulers mainly rests, have been undermined the national movement will have made considerable progress.

a. *Battle against the divide-and-rule policy*

It has been the very first task of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, in confrontation of the divide-and-rule policy of the rulers, to carry out inexorable propaganda in favour of *Indonesian unity* and *solidarity*. A large part of the contents of *Indonesia Merdeka*, Dutch edition, and at least seventy percent of the debates in the Malayan edition are devoted to this.

In *Indonesia Merdeka* no. 3, 1925, Perhimpoenan Indonesia especially addressed itself to the youth movement in the Fatherland. Because it was especially the young people who were too much infected in Indonesia by the pernicious divide-and-rule bacillus. And it further stands to reason that the seed of provincialism and antagonism should be nursed with great care especially within receptive Indonesian youth. For, today's youth are tomorrow's people; and that which today's youth thinks will be thought by the people of the near future. This danger to Indonesia is the greater because a large part of our future leaders must be recruited from the present school-age youth.

How much this peaceful propaganda of Perhimpoenan Indonesia is feared, and in any case not tolerated, by the rulers is shown by the fact that the holding back of *Indonesia Merdeka* numbers at the Indonesian Post Office started with the above mentioned 1925 number which contained the address to the Indonesian youth movement. Here is another example of the extent to which the *arbitrari-*

ness of the authorities can reach. There is a *legal* guarantee that any document printed in the Netherlands may be freely imported into Indonesia; the import of documents printed elsewhere may be refused by the Governor-General, provided such a document is cited by name in the official newspaper. And now the *Indonesia Merdeka* issues are held back with *juristic* arguments that they had in fact been admitted, since they had passed Customs at the border.

With reason, *Indonesia Merdeka* writes about this behaviour:
'Where are the Dutch servants who are supposed to see that the laws are complied with? Or must these laws be maintained only when they are in favour of the white authorities and they become waste paper when the interests of the whites are threatened?'[74]

But in spite of these retentions of *Indonesia Merdeka* numbers the Indonesian idea of unity is steadily permeating the various layers of the population. The padi grows inaudibly! Our society was already pregnant with the New Idea!

Of this propaganda for *unity* and *solidarity Indonesia Merdeka* says:
'To the cadre of the intellectual sons and daughters of the enslaved people falls the duty to transplant into Indonesia's fertile soil the precious plant of solidarity and to nurture it with care and love till it becomes the steel of freedom's weapons'.[75]

And indeed, many of the repatriated members of Perhimpoenan Indonesia have worked in the service of the Indonesian ideal of unity and solidarity. They have managed to bring about a measure of solidarity, both amongst the Indonesian political parties and amongst the youth movement. On 21-22nd August 1926 there was created at Bandoeng the national *Committee for Unity* under the leadership of a former Secretary of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, and which was joined by fourteen larger and smaller parties. With this, the fundation stone was laid for the formation of a *National Concentration*, for which Perhimpoenan Indonesia is constantly striving. Meanwhile the *Partij National Indonesia* (P.N.I.) was founded, which continues to propagate these principles of Indonesian unity.

Also among the Indonesian youth this spirit of unity, the Greater Indonesia idea has taken possession. About mid-1927 the youth organisation *Jong Indonesia* was created. Its aims are, as described in art. 2 of its draft-erticles of association:
'The propagation and consolidation of the concept of a national Indonesian unity in Indonesians'.

All those who were no longer satisfied with the existing youth

organisations such as Jong-Java, Jong-Sumatranen Bond and others, which have not been able yet to free themselves of all insular aspects, have joined.

In connection with the foundation of *Jong Indonesia*, *Indonesia Merdeka* writes:

'We cannot but hail the birth of Jong-Indonesia with delight. It is a continuation of the spirit of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. As a young shoot from the old tree we must keep a careful eye on its growth and encourage it. In our "Open Letter to the Youth Societies in Indonesia" which however never reached its destination because of colonial censorship, we have already urged the urgency of "unite". And it is with satisfaction that we can now state that the seed scattered by us has taken root.

Jong Indonesia has an important role to play. Not only must it put into practice the concept of unity among young people, but it must also see to it that the new generation on its way to freedom pulls down everything first in order to build up a new national life adapted to the demands of modern civilisation!'[76]

In his inaugural address, the Chairman of the Batavia branch of Young Indonesia said: 'It is not our duty to unite the old, who are already set in their ways and ideas; our task is restricted to the young because Indonesia's future lies in their hands!' There we have a conscious acceptance of an historical duty!

Mr. President! I am mentioning all these things because I am concerned here with the *action* of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. As an honest fighter for my ideals I do not want to hide anything from you, and it would be good if people knew exactly what this society of 'kids' stands for. I want to sketch here very clearly, as far as I can, the range which the tentacles of Perhimpoenan Indonesia cover in the service of the concept of Indonesian unity.

The concept of Indonesian unity is an important element in the system of action of Perhimpoenan Indonesia because all other action depends on it. Thus we find in Article 3 of its regulations:

'The society tries to achieve its objective particularly by a reinforcement of the concept of Indonesian unity.'

Perhimpoenan Indonesia has, because of its intensive propaganda, achieved the result that in Indonesia too its principles of unity are becoming more and more common. And that will make the ideal of a free country a little more concrete. On the simple flag of every nationalist political party in Indonesia there is written: *One united Indonesia*; *Indonesia above all things*!

Yes, even the specifically Javanese *Boedi Oetomo* has made this device its own. This is a characteristic of the times!

Thus it is not accidental that especially recently the matter of Indonesia's unity has been particularly discussed in the camp of the ruler. They reject this concept and try to suggest to the world that the *Indonesia people* do not exist and cannot exist. Thus even Mr. Treub in his brochure 'Indonesia's future'[77] has expressed the thought that the Dutch Indies consist of a conglomeration of peoples who belong to various *human races*,[78] with different *religions*, manners and customs, which have only this in common, that they are all governed by the Dutch authorities.

This bold statement was disproved by some Professors of Leiden University in their article in *De Gids* titled: 'Attack on Leiden', from which we quote the following words:

'Without venturing on a prophecy about the national development which the Dutch Indies has in store for us, we deny on objective grounds that the native population of Indonesia "belongs to different human *races*" which "have only this in common that (their areas) are all subject to Dutch rule" . . . and we would like to state as a *fact*, contradicting the latter, that the majority belong to one single race the *Indonesian* race, which now as in the past has had a number of mutual bonds, the extent of which is still increasing in significance.'[79]

But Mr. Treub in all his superficiality obviously knows best. And it would suit the paid propagandists of the Indonesian Board of Trade to check the national growth of Indonesia by all possible means. It is not surprising either that just lately so many quasi-scholars and so-called colonial 'specialists' have occupied themselves with the 'political principles' which as they put it, are 'more suited to the heterogeneous population of the Dutch Indies'. It is clear what they are aiming at. They want to devise a political system for Indonesia in which the principle of divide-and-rule has been worked out.

But the propaganda for Indonesian unity of Perhimpoenan Indonesia is already showing results. The present-day Indonesians will not be misled again by deceptive and suggestive phrases which are preached in the camp of the ruler. Greatly significant are the words of the Chairman of the Batavia Branch of Jong-Indonesia:

'It is not our duty to unite the old who are already set in their ways and ideas; our task is exclusively restricted to the young, because Indonesia's future lies in their hands.'[80]

Those few words mean a lot. The new generation, the *nation of the future* consciously wants to be the propagator of the concept of Indonesian unity.

But can one Indonesian nation exist, considering the number of languages, characteristics, manners and customs among the population of the Dutch Indies, some wondcr with apprehension. History gives numerous examples of cases where a nation is determined neither by a unity of descent neither by a unity of religion, nor by a unity of language, but merely by the *belief* of *belonging to a unit*, or, as Professor Kranenburg says:
'In the awareness of belonging together as an organised group'.[81]
'Une nation est une âme, un principe spirituel' says Renan.

The conviction of belonging together forever, based on the common experience of centuries and based on the geographical situation of Indonesia for international trade, is sufficient for the Indonesians to prepare the rebirth of the Indonesian people. When the concept of Indonesian unity has become a widespread ideal, then the Indonesian nation has been born. To accelerate this process is the task of Perhimpoenan Indonesia.

b. *Struggle against the colonial policy of non-education*

It is obvious that the *real* struggle against keeping the masses in ignorance must be fought in Indonesia itself. It it the task of the national movement on the spot. What the Perhimpoenan Indonesia can do about it, is to propagate the principles which will liberate the masses as soon as possible from this spiritual tyranny of the Dutch colonial policy. In the first place it has pointed out the necessity for *mass education*, both for young people and for adults. *Indonesia Merdeka* says about this:
'Our people is deliberately denied education and it is up to us to change it. The mass school where youth daily gathers under supervision, is the most suitable place for it . . . In the first place it (education) must teach our youth that the freedom of our country is their aim in life. Thus we will bring up citizens who are fit to compete for the highest prize on behalf of our country.'[82]

It fits in very well with Dutch colonial policy, whose starting point is that the colony serves to support the welfare of the mother country, that cultivation of ideals in the masses should be avoided. 'Since the spirit provides the internal power for human action, it

is not surprising that one of the most important points of the colonial policy is to choke the spiritual growth of the colonial people.'[83]

Perhimpoenan Indonesia has always been pre-occupied with the question of how to free the Indonesian masses from this spiritual oppression. Its *principle of non-cooperation* should be a beneficial influence in this respect. By impressing this principle on the masses, one awakes in them the awareness of their political rights and at the same time increases their self-activity. In the same strain *Indonesia Merdeka* speaks:

'Now it's up to the new generation to impress upon our people the spirit of freedom which inspires us, in order to show the world that our ideal for freedom is growing in spite of all oppression.'[84]

It is not like Perhimpoenan Indonesia to regard mass education merely as the way to cure illiteracy. Yet we are continually mindful of the effective way in which the Americans promoted mass education in the Philippines when they took this country under their protection. Soldiers, civil servants, servants, pensioners, yes, almost all who were at all familiar with the alphabet, were sent to the villages to teach the art of reading and writing. This is one method of doing it, but it is not sufficient. Moreover it will cost millions of guilders to carry out this operation properly in Indonesia. And the Indonesian mass movement has not that much money at its disposal. Mass education has been too shamefully neglected by the Indonesian government, for the ideal of Indonesian freedom to be made to pay for it. No, Mr. President, Indonesia cannot and will not wait until the last farmer from the last village can wield a pen to regain his freedom. The mass education of Perhimpoenan Indonesia must aim at the character-formation of the masses. For the capacity of a people is not determined in the first place by the number of literates, but by the character of its people. That is why Perhimpoenan Indonesia aims at raising the intellectual level – in the widest sense of the word – of the population.

It must be our objective, and what we propagate, to widen the horizon of the masses by popular mass education, in history, politics and others as happens in *Denmark* in the so-called 'people's college', an invention of the well-known pedagogue Grundtvig. We are not concerned here with the popularisation of knowledge or something like that, but the idea is to make the great spiritual movements in the lives of peoples and humanity and the struggle for the Idea for Justice and Truth, accessible to the minds of primitive people.[85] 'It (the people's college) does not want to create submissive people, it

does not want to clothe the mind in uniform, but it wants to educate the masses to be mature members of society.'[86]

Indonesia Merdeka thinks along the same lines, saying:
'We know how difficult it is to mark a clear line, along which the masses can confidently approach their goal. Especially now, when national awareness still has to be consolidated. Mass education and school education will have to go together to form a harmonious whole. To put it more clearly, apart from education for the young people there must also be more education for the masses. But do not get this wrong: it is not only reading and writing we are aiming for. By pure mass education we mean: to make the people realise the great value of their physical and *psychological* constitution. The former leads us to a higher level of public health, which will make us more successful in the struggle for life. A sound body is necessary to translate ideas into action, a healthy nation will be less susceptible to unfavourable influences . . .
The latter, the *psychological*, increases and strengthens the quality of our people.'[87]

An important element in the fight against keeping the masses in ignorance Perhimpoenan Indonesia considers, as I have already said, to be the *political* education of the masses, making them aware of their political rights. Its *non-cooperation principle* could play a part in this, for it teaches the people to know themselves and to rely on their own efforts. Non-cooperation as a system also advocates a 'parliamentary training' – if I may say so – of the Indonesian leaders, a training in the sense, that they will be given the opportunity to deliberate upon important matters of national concern which, in a free country, fall under the care of parliament. Perhimpoenan Indonesia, completely ignoring the General Council, has its own 'National Council' in the form of yearly or half-yearly 'National Congresses', in which leaders of various groups of the population will participate.

Here real *leaders*, real *representatives* of the people will act as spokesmen, and not as in the 'General Council' of the Indonesian government, on which only dubious 'leaders', mostly puppets of the almighty authorities and of the well-organised P.E.B. clique can sit. Yes, apart from taking up the *non-cooperation policy*, the real leaders of the people can hardly get a seat in this 'illustrious' company, as a result of the election system and the system of nomination. And because of the mere fact that those who have been in prison are excluded from membership of the 'General Council',

the leaders of the people are kept out of this institution. For, in connection with the practice of racial justice and the great elasticity of the penal law in Indonesia, almost all good leaders of the people have seen the inside of prison because of speech and press offences. But this is not the basic problem we are concerned with here! What is of importance to us is that the place of a leader of the people is *not* in the 'General Council' of the Indonesian Government but among his people. His meeting-place, where matters are involved that concern all the population, will only be the National Congresses, a permanent Institution with its own organs, founded by Perhimpoenan Indonesia for this purpose.

Maybe the present National Congresses outwardly resemble the Indian 'National Congress', but nevertheless they are of native origin. Perhimpoenan Indonesia does not want to create something new, for its National Congresses are merely an extension of the system that the Indonesian villages have known of old. They are intended as just another form of the 'Rapats' or village meetings which are still very much alive among the Indonesian people, on a larger scale and on a modern basis. There will be *representatives* of the whole national Indonesian Commonwealth. In that direction Perhimpoenan Indonesia wants to lead the development of political awareness in the masses, their sense of responsibility and the awareness of the Indonesian leaders of their leadership. A preparation to achieve an organised secular purpose. And that is after all what the government desires too!

c. *Struggle against the psychological injection of the idea of superiority of the white race and of the unassailability of its position etc.*

Mr. President! I have now come to the *third* psychological power *factor* on which the influence of the ruler is based, i.e. the psychological injection of the idea of superiority of the white race and of the unassailability of its position, coupled with the suggestion of national impotence of the Indonesians.

For years the Indonesians have lived under this colonial hypnosis, until in the end they also believed in their own impotence and that the ruler was indispensable to give the country leadership. It does not suit the Dutch colonial system, whose starting point is that Indonesia must remain an eternal appendage of the mother country,

Holland, to promote a feeling of independence among the native colonial subjects. Day in day out it has been emphasised that the Indonesians do not possess the capacities for leadership and that they are not capable of initiative, so that really they are predestined from the day of their birth to work under European leadership. This suggestion has a depressing effect on weak natures. Unfailingly they seize every opportunity to nurse the Indonesians' lack of confidence in their own abilities. And here in Holland this suggestion is propagated by the brown 'Dutchman' Noto Soeroto, in numerous lectures and in letters in the magazine *Oedaja.* At a meeting of the *Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond*[88] in 1925 he spoke to the following effect:
'Experience has taught us that our leaders (he means: Indonesian leaders) must move in the economic, cultural and pedagogic fields, that they must restrict themselves to details, they must, submissive as they are, stay in subservient positions, for "the general management must remain in the hands of the Dutch".'[89]

Mr. President! This belief in their own impotence and feeling of dependence on the white ruler are encouraged in the practice of government by the dual system.

For the colonial administration has the system of an *European* governing body and a *native* governing body, in which the latter is always subordinated to the former. An Indonesian official must always be the inferior of and supervised by a European official, even if both have had the same training at the 'Indological faculty'. Yes, even when the Indonesian has more years in office and is more experienced than the European.

It is obvious that this dualism also inspired arrogance in the European civil servants. When governor-general Mr. De Graeff introduced the conference of 'regents', the assistant resident Meyer-Ranneft could not hide his disgust in the General Council. He said, among other things, that 'to pass over one of the highest officials of the provincial section (to which he himself belonged) is a deed not in accordance with the courtesy we have been used to up to now'.[90]

The gentlemen feel slighted! Maybe they saw in this the beginning of the 'emancipation' of the regents and so of their independence.

The suggestion of national impotence of Indonesians and the injection of the idea of superiority of the white race, is necessary to the colonial ruler, in order to maintain his authority. As a result of the indoctrination of years, the Indonesian population was be-

ginning to doubt its own capacity. *Indonesia Merdeka* stated about three years ago:

'Until recently all of Indonesia lay enfolded in trust and resignation. It believed that all would come right one day, but if it didn't turn out as expected, then resignation would give consolation and courage to live on.'[91]

Perhimpoenan Indonesia realised that the feeling of inferiority in the masses is a great hindrance in achieving its ideals. And that is why they feel that it is their first duty to the masses to instill into their minds self-respect and a feeling of self-esteem. The masses *must* be pulled out of the rut of profound resignation. And here the *non-cooperation principle* can have a corrective influence again. In order to reach the very foundations of the postions of power of the ruler, *Indonesia Merdeka* says:

'As a weapon in our fight "non-cooperation" is preferable to any other method. The initial task in our struggle is to smooth the way and to remove all obstacles. For too long the *Blanda* (Dutchmen) in our country have been held in great respect. We can clearly see our task now. We must first encourage people to destroy this reputation. And when that undeserved respect has been destroyed, we can proceed to more forceful action.

By attaching no value to the Dutch myth, we restore the *self-confidence* of our people and show the masses that the white man is not indispensable in Indonesia.

And what a source of power we will then find.'[92]

In its propaganda to arouse self-respect and a feeling of self-esteem in the masses Perhimpoenan Indonesia was greatly helped by the circumstances in Indonesia itself. The widespread *corruption* both at the top and the bottom of the *white civil service* which thrived under the regime of Governor-General Fock, the P.E.B.-*scandal*, which made it its object to bribe the regents for the P.E.B.-cause – all those were factors that must not be underrated for destroying the reputation of the white man in Indonesia.

However, Perhimpoenan Indonesia realises that self-respect and a sense of self-esteem are not sufficient to achieve its objective. The people must be taught to have confidence in their own power and capabilities. The people must learn to help themselves in the struggle for life. The people must break away from the feeling of dependence, from the feeling that only the ruler will be capable of improving their economic and social position. People must know that the *colonial policy* is *not* capable of it. By extending its *non-*

cooperation principle in the positive direction, Perhimpoenan Indonesia approaches the field of *self-help* or *self-activity*. Under its own leadership the people must take the initiative for the improvement of its own welfare. Thus the difficult task of the Indonesian leaders – and Perhimpoenan Indonesia is fully aware of it – is that it must stimulate the urge for action of its fellow-countrymen and direct them in the awakening of their own powers, making use of the inventions of modern science and technology. Mr. President! You will now see the great difference between the *non-cooperation* system of Mahatma Gandhi and that of *Perhimpoenan Indonesia.*

Gandhi wants to return to national tradition. Above all in order to boycott everything that is British he urged the Indian people to use the old primitive means of production like weaving looms in the old style. He wanted to defy the economic laws and that was what caused the failure of his system.

Just because the Gandhi systen of *non-cooperation* failed, one should not imagine that it will be the same with the *non-cooperation* of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. For Perhimpoenan Indonesia emphasises, not the negative, but the positive side of the system. And its system is adapted to the demands of modern society. Its system is the driving power to awake the latent powers in the masses. Its basic system of self-activity is based on the characteristics peculiar to the people, and which since ancient times have been the main features of Indonesian society. Those are *solidarity* and the *willingness to help*! These are a firm foundation for the organisation of cooperative societies, which are extremely useful for an agricultural people such as the Indonesian, which otherwise would be squeezed out by the strong pressure of powerful foreign capital. The organisation of farmers' unions is for Perhimpoenan Indonesia an indispensable condition for chanelling the latent powers of its people and developing self-confidence in the people.

Some two years ago I said in my 'Economic World Structure and the conflict of Power':

'The cooperative societies are especially of importance for national economic reconstruction. Under the powerful domination of foreign capital with the foreign government as its natural guardian, as is the case at the moment with Indonesia, which only results in misery and pauperism, only a cooperatively organised economic life can successfully hold its own. At the moment it is also the only form of economic organisation which has any chance of success in laying the foundations for our economic reconstruction. A typical example

of this we find in Denmark, which is rightly called "the cooperative Commonwealth". By means of a cooperative organisation the Danish people have succeeded in a break-away from the situation of poverty and are now one of the most prosperous nations in the world. When regaining our national freedom the economic struggle must not fall behind the political struggle. Both are indispensable factors for the achievement of our ultimate ideal.'[93]

Because of the fantastic results of the cooperative system in Denmark, the officials of Perhimpoenan Indonesia sent two of its members to that country in 1925 to study the system on the spot and to examine moreover to what extent the cooperative system in Indonesia, considering the situation and circumstances, is feasible!

Quite frankly, Mr. President, the *non-cooperation principle* of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, which emphasises self-activity and self-help, does all it can do to convince the Indonesian people that the Dutch are not indispensable to Indonesia. And in that way Perhimpoenan Indonesia also wants to undermine the third psychological power-factor on which the authority and reputation of the ruler rest.

d. *Struggle against the Association policy*

Mr. President! I have now come to the fourth psychological power factor on which the authority and the respect of the ruler are partly based: the *association policy*.

The ruler is obviously aware that sooner or later the feeling of self-esteem and independence will arise in the dominated people. And that is why they want to channel these feelings in advance along the lines that are most advantageous for Holland by means of the association policy. For instance the idea was propagated of a union of the states of Indonesia and Holland 'on equal terms'. They are trying to make the Indonesian people, or rather the intellectual part of it, believe that Holland and Indonesia do not have conflicting interests, but common interests. And that is why they should be eternally together, according to this logic, in one *superstate*. But the Dutch will be the leaders. It is obvious that a true Indonesian nationalist must reject this unnatural situation. For it simply amounts to giving up the idea of a free Indonesian country and resigning oneself to a system in which Indonesia remains the appendix of the mother-country Holland. But due to the indoctrination for years of the Indonesian people of its inferiority and of the excellent qualities

of the West, many Indonesian intellectuals initially walked into the trap.

Moreover many Dutchmen in Indonesia were busily propagating the idea of the brotherhood of man and the association of east and west. And it was the susceptible Indonesian youth, that could not resist this foreign infection.

One cannot blame them too much, for they have always lived under colonial hypnosis. Therefore it is the duty of Perhimpoenan Indonesia to warn its countrymen against the wolf in sheep's clothing. *Indonesia Merdeka* says on this subject:

'For us nationalists the brotherhood of races and peoples means at the moment: flagging of zeal, and cooling of the enthusiasm for national honour and dignity.

Our objective will become blurred: a source of courage and will-power lies in the very fact that the objective is clearly defined. National freedom is the only slogan at the moment which can bring inspiration. For the masses this is something real which they can experience, and it is only from this that restless action for better living conditions can result.'[94]

It is obvious that this so-called association policy wants to disguise the essential elements in the colonial situation, the racial conflict and the conflict of interests, in order to weaken the power of the national movement. For it is exactly the racial conflict and the conflict of interests which arouse the desire for immediate independence of the country.

In reply to these efforts to disguise the colonial conflicts the asnwer of *Indonesia Merdeka* is worth noting:

'Sharpening the conflict, and marking the demarcation line between white and brown will antagonise the outside world and strengthen the close relationship within.'[95]

Silently the padi grows! The principles of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, propagated with the power of conviction, have gained ground in Indonesia! *Indonesia Merdeka* also says:

'The voice of Indonesia Merdeka has been one of the factors that has given the impulse to the enlightenment of ideas. The voice has met with a wide response, because the concept of unity was already in the Indonesian air.'[96]

Perhimpoenan Indonesia is proud that its action has contributed so much to the acceleration of the tragic end of the association policy, instead of which a policy was born for: *Indonesia Merdeka.*

Mr. President! I have described the actions of Perhimpoenan Indonesia quite elaborately to bring out very clearly what it wants and how it is going about it. I did not conceal the fact that its action is restricted to a large extent to a systematic destruction of he psychological foundations on which the authority and respect of the ruler are partly based. And nobody can blame us for that. For these are the factors which divide the Indonesian people, deny them education, make them submissive and finally deceive them. The undermining of these factors, which check the growth of the powers of the people, together with propaganda for its principle, is an indispensable condition for Perhimpoenan Indonesia to achieve the education of the people in the broadest sense of the word.

Being aware that the colonial problem is mainly a problem of power, Perhimpoenan Indonesia sees a possibility, as has been said, for the achievement of national freedom by asking the *power question*. To reach that stage the first requirement is self-confidence, *self-active nationalist* mass action. The non-cooperation principle, which involves self-activity, is the driving power which must awaken the Indonesian masses as soon as possible, make it aware of its political rights, and stimulate its activity in the economic field. Moreover this system has provided a true people's representation in the shape of *National Congresses* in which various political aspirations which exist in the nation, can be expressed. And at the same time these national congresses are meant to be the 'trustworthy interpreters of the sense of justice of the people'. In this way we are gradually succeeding in forming our own national existence with its own organs and its own voice.

The system of Perhimpoenan Indonesia is directed towards the promotion of self-confidence and self-awareness of the people and to instill in it the conviction that the Dutch in Indonesia are not indispensable. And this is what I, Mr. President, meant by 'the formation of a State within a State'. The formation of the Indonesian nation with its own organs, and its own life, even if for the present under foreign domination! Perhimpoenan Indonisia does not consider it of paramount importance how Indonesia will be liberated, but rather how independence, once we have obtained it, must be maintained. Once we have got independence we must not allow chaos to arise, which could only result in new domination by another foreign nation. In this spirit alone can the action of Perhimpoenan Indonesia be understood, when it speaks of the formation of a state within a state!

We can now ask, how Perhimpoenan Indonesia feels about the actual position of the ruler, supported by the power of white weapons having an army in a state of preparedness at his disposal. Everybody will understand that against this superior power an unorganised, or not sufficiently organised, mass cannot do anything. Therefore the system of Perhimpoenan Indonesia has no use for a policy of sentiment.[97] For such a policy, inspired by an uncontrolled urge to attack the colonial stronghold with *klewang* (sabre) and *patjol* (spade) can only end in self-destruction. Against this superior armed force only a massive movement can hold its own. And that is why the national movement in Indonesia must first of all see to it that an organised mass action is formed, for only this will be in a position to ask the ultimate power question. World history has taught us that against an organised mass movement of the people the armed forces of the government have little chance of success. It is no secret, Mr. President, that the national freedom propaganda will eventually also reach the hearts of the Indonesian soldiers and civil servants, who are the two main pillars that support colonial domination. Although the colonial government can keep them imprisoned within an armoured wall of all kinds of regulations, at some time their hearts will open to the voice of the time. Here time is our most powerful ally.

That servicemen may not engage in politics almost goes without saying. But than even civil servants of the administration are forbidden, on penalty of discharge, to join a party which aims at the discontinuation of the colonial situation, springs from what I called before: 'colonial right', alias arbitrariness. Again this is a characteristic phenomenon of colonial society, where right is synonymous with might, that the Indonesian civil servants are regarded as mere *wage-slaves* of the authorities, people who are not allowed to have any say. Is it surprising then that many Indonesian officials for conscience's sake secretly participate in the nationalist movement all the same?

In a free country such as Holland the position of civil servants is different from that in colonised Indonesia. Regardless of their political convictions, the basic rights of free citizens apply to them too. The Dutch government has among its civil servants various elements which are not only in principle hostile to the existing political system but also often actively propagate their principles. This is not admissible in this country, because it is a recognised principle that the power element in the civil servant situation

only exists, when the nature of the position requires it, i.e. only in those situations where quick action, for instance in the army, is a necessary condition. This is not the case with regard to the civil servants of the administration. And that is why Professor Kranenburg says:

'If one sees the power element as a very important factor, then one tends to regard the position of the civil servant as completely dependent on the authorities, to consider them as an *object*, as a tool in the hands of the authorities, who can use it or throw it away as they please.

But when one considers the nature of the different services more carefully and compares them, then divides them and analyses them, then the question of the legal basis of the power situation immediately arises, quickly followed by the realisation that the special power position exists when and only insofar as the nature of the service requires. Thus the civil servant is only bound to obedience within the requirement of official business and to the extent that the smooth functioning of the service requires it. Connected with this it would be desirable for officials to be given guarantees that only *objective* criteria will be decisive for the exercising of authority.'[98]

And that is what one of the most prominent Dutch lawyers says! And this opinion has found a wide response here in Indonesia. But what a difference! What they consider as undesirable in their own country, that a civil servant should become an object, a tool in the hands of the government, they regard as the ideal in the colony, at least insofar as it concerns the Indonesian civil servants. And this is the essence of the *colonial policy*! And can they then demand respect for the authority from the Indonesian civil servant? The wrongness of his position forces him into rebellion against this absolutism. As long as the Indonesian government has the Indonesian civil servant under colonial hypnosis, so long they will behave as willing wage-slaves. But already *Indonesia Merdeka* observes:

'But in the long run even this category of Indonesians cannot guard themselves against the extremely infectious germ of nationalism. Thus at the present there are many facts that seem to indicate a silent sympathy with the mass movement, especially from young civil servants, and it will not be long before the most courageous and the most scrupulous of them, who can no longer bear the regime, will either execute the orders of the government with great reluctance or simply leave the civil service. Will the government be able to keep the army and police which consist of mainly Indone-

sians, away from the influence of nationalism, that penetrates as an invisible fluid into the remotest cells of the national body.'[99]

The Dutch government should remember the remark of Clive Day, that the favourable disposition of the Indonesian officials is the chief instrument of the Dutch ruling technique in the islands,[100] that entwine 'the equator like an emerald belt', and let them not deceive themselves that their colonial power will stand forever. And especially they should not think that they can maintain their colonial power by ever-increasing arbitrariness and terror. For those are the best means of accelerating the process of decay of the colonial regime. 'To us it is a foregone conclusion that the colonial edifice will crumble to the ground one day. It is only a question of time, of sooner or later, and not of yes or no. The rising tide cannot be turned: the future is a sea that knows no ebb'.[101]

7. SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPLES AND ACTIVITIES OF PERHIMPOENAN INDONESIA

The four elements in the activities of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, namely: *national unity* and *solidarity*, *non-cooperation* and *self-help* have succeeded in shaking the psychological pillars of the position of authority of the ruler one by one. Perhimpoenan Indonesia have been able in this way to promote the feeling of self-esteem and self-confidence in their countrymen. One must remember, however, that it has not preached or taught anything new. Its success can especially be ascribed to the *accurate description* of the colonial situation and the colonial conflict of interests. They succeeded in giving a clear expression to the lively feelings which already lodged in the hearts of their countrymen, but which had not yet taken shape. The seed it has strewn about has fallen on fertile soil and is fruitful. This is the secret of its success!

These principles and their line of action which have made Perhimpoenan Indonesia famous in its own country are clearly formulated in the *outline of principles of 1925*. It runs as follows:

1. Only an Indonesia which feels itself to be united, and putting the differences between them on one side, can break the power of domination. The common goal – the liberation of Indonesia – requires *nationalist* mass action, aware of and relying on their own power.

2. The participation of *all* strata of the Indonesian population in this united struggle for independence is an indispensable condition for achieving that objective.
3. A dominating and essential element in every colonial political problem is the *conflict of interests* between *ruler and ruled.* The reaction of the ruled to the tendency of the policy of the ruler to disguise this element, must be one of *sharpened accentuation* of all conflict.
4. Considering the disrupting and demoralising influence of colonial domination on the psychological and physical constitution of Indonesian life, we must devote all our energy to bringing back the spiritual and material situation to normality.

The first two principles comprise the concept of Indonesian *unity* and *solidarity.* And as I have said before these are indispensable conditions for the formation of national powers; and only this formation of power, which means mass action, can pose the ultimate *power question.* The *third* principle embraces the *non-cooperation* principle. And in the *fourth* principle the concept of *self-help* is realised.

Since Perhimpoenan Indonesia is based at such a distance from the native country and is mainly a student organisation its task is of a *preparing* nature. Its task is principally to establish and propagate national principles which it has found via an analysis of the colonial situation. And that is why its objective is, as it says in article 2 of its statute:

'To *labour* for the independence of Indonesia'. To translate these principles into action is the task of an organisation which is based in the native country. Perhimpoenan Indonesia wants above all a purely nationalist party, which relies only on its own powers and ability. It rejects every illusion that Indonesia could ever expect *direct help* in its struggle for freedom from abroad. *Indonesia Merdeka* speaks to the same effect when it discusses the national claims of the coloured peoples:

'We nationalists must see the world as it is, for only then can our attitude towards it be pure. The above examples should have convinced us that the salvation of our country must come from us ourselves. We can no longer expect help from the ruler who will not voluntarily give up his security for the satisfaction of his material hunger, nor can we rely on the League of Nations, which seems to have become a union specifically for the European nations that feel threatened. In this national struggle for freedom we can only rely

on our own powers. Therefore our slogan will be: *self-confidence* and *willingness to make sacrifices*. And with this device we will march to victory.'[102]

In this, i.e. relying on our own powers and capabilities, Perhimpoenan Indonesia is distinguished from all internationally orientated movements. The only thing it expects from the outside world is sympathy or moral support; but no more than that, and no more than that does it want. Its foreign propaganda only aims at arousing the *moral* sympathy of the humanitarian part of the world and to show up those practices of the Dutch colonial regime that cannot bear the light of day.

In order to find a way of translating its principles into action Perhimpoenan Indonesia has stimulated the foundation of an Indonesian National People's Party on a purely nationalist basis. And it has brought pressure to bear on its ex-members and supporters in Indonesia to urge on this foundation.[103] At our committee meeting of the 23rd November 1926 we drew up a plan of campaign, which we have recommended to our supporters in Indonesia. I say 'recommended', Mr. President, because Perhimpoenan Indonesia does not presume to know best and does not want to have the last word at all costs. It would be foolish to lay down the law to people who are deeply involved in the political struggle. This plan of campaign consists of political, economic and social items as follows:

a. *Political*:
1. Self-determination for the Indonesian people;
2. A future Indonesian form of government on a purely democratic basis, with the village community as the central element;
3. Freedom of the press and unrestricted right of association and public meeting;
4. Abolition of the 'exorbitant' right of the Governor-General;
5. Universal franchise.

b. *Economic*:
1. Promotion of agricultural cooperation and loan banks for the people;
2. Promotion of national industry on a cooperative basis;
3. Abolition of the system of land-revenue;
4. The abolition of private estates;
5. A just regulation of the taxation policy, with exemption from

tax for the farmers with landed property amounting to less than half a *bouw*.

c. *Social*:
1. Social legislation; abolition of penal sanctions; an eight-hour working day;
2. Radical elimination of usury;
3. Promotion of national education;
4. Improvement of the public health.

Mr. President, perhaps you will know from the dossier that these items of the programme are considered by our supporters in Indonesia to be too moderate and are regarded as being contrary to the principle of *non-cooperation.*[104] They feared they would not be to the liking of the people. So you see what a militant spirit there is among the masses over in Indonesia, because of the terrorist measures of the Fock regime. A programme of action that takes into account the principles of Perhimpoenan Indonesia would not go far enough for them.

In the meantime a misunderstanding has arisen with our supporters in Indonesia concerning the character of our principles, which could easily be caused by their brief wording. They probably thought that this programme only consisted of requests to the government and that Perhimpoenan Indonesia, having made its demands, would leave the field of non-cooperation policies. But that is not what the Perhimpoenan Indonesia meant by its programme. For it is a programme of *action* that consists both of demands, to be made to the government, and for which we must probably fight, and *promises* to the people which we will fulfil to the last item as soon as we have the right of self-determination. But the programme also contains a third category, which must be realised by our own powers and capacities. And that is the realisation of the concept of *self-help*! This whole programme of action is consistent with the system of non-cooperation of Perhimpoenan Indonesia!

But this is not the place to give an elaborate explanation of this programme, so that I can let that point rest.

To Perhimpoenan Indonesia it is only of importance, that the nationalist party which it considers so indispensable should be founded as quickly as possible. And we achieved our goal, when in September 1927 the *Partai National Indonesia* was founded in Bandung! A new future now awaits the national movement in our country.

8. PERHIMPOENAN INDONESIA AND THE QUESTION OF VIOLENCE

Mr. President! I have now come to the *question of violence*. Since we are charged with 'deliberate incitement against the government', I would like to examine here, what attitude *Perhimpoenan Indonesia* takes with regard to *violence*.

First I would like to remark that incitement does not fit in with the system of action of the Perhimpoenan Indonesia. For incitement amounts to stirring up the weaker, yet insufficiently organised national group against the well-organised superior forces of the ruler, which must necessarily end in self-destruction.[105] Nobody in their senses would choose to do this for this would mean a needless prolongation of the struggle for independence. No, Mr. President, Perhimpoenan Indonesia wants to take the most direct and at the same time shorter route. It wants above all the formation of a national power, to place the national forces against the forces of the ruler, its own organisation opposite the latter's organisation. And to achieve that, it has propagated Indonesian unity and solidarity, *non-cooperation* and *self-help*. Self-confidence and a general political awareness are necessary conditions to form a power, to promote mass action.

Whether the act of posing the power question must necessarily end in a violent clash is a matter which depends *entirely on the attitude and tact of Holland*.

And as regards Perhimpoenan Indonesia itself, neither in its articles of association nor in its principles is there any element of violence. To Perhimpoenan Indonesia violence is not a principle, but a matter of *utility*. Even less does the Indonesian people, which because of its culture is pacifist by nature, wish to use violence at all costs. But if this meek people do resort to violence, then they do so because there is no alternative and because they are forced to it, as the Fock regime did. Perhimpoenan Indonesia has spoken of violence several times in *Indonesia Merdeka*. Via an analysis of the colonial situation and of the conflict of interests between Holland and Indonesia it has come to the conclusion that the independence of Indonesia can only be achieved by violence. This is not a startling discovery for it is an historical law that the birth of a nation always involves blood and tears. On this subject *Indonesia Merdeka* says:

'Sooner or later every dominated people will want to regain its freedom; that is the iron law of world history. Only the circumstances under which this liberation takes place are partly determined

by the attitude of those who are in power. It depends mainly on them whether the birth of freedom will involve blood and tears, or whether the process will develop peacefully.'[106]

At present there is no longer any doubt about Holland's attitude. During the discussion of the bill dealing with the form of Government of the Dutch Indies in the colonial debate in the Parliament of 1925, it became obvious again that Holland will never voluntarily withdraw from the colony.

I would like to repeat here, Mr. President, that I am extremely sorry that in my cell I do not have at my disposal the reports of the Parliamentary Debates to substantiate this statement with the concrete and complete facts. But when discussing the extent to which an exploitation colony could be given self-government, I have already given two quotes, the statement of the Committee of Report in the Second Chamber in 1919 and the statement of one of the Ministers, De Graaff, in the First Chamber.[107]

Mr. President! Since the matter under discussion is of the utmost importance, I would like to quote some more statements of right-wing and liberal speakers in parliament, as far as I have them at my disposal. I quote them, hoping that the situation of a colonised nation, which has suffered and hoped for centuries, will be judged from a liberal point of view of justice, humanity and morality. I will leave on one side here as of no account the foolish efforts of those who want to Christianise the Indonesian people in order to retain the bond between Holland and Indonesia forever!

a. Mr. Gerritsen in the Second Chamber:
   'For Holland too the existence of its relation with Indonesia is of the utmost importance. Both areas, Holland and the Dutch Indies, should stay together for a long time yet. It is in the interests of both and therefore it should be seen to, better than has been done in the Bill, that the bond between Indonesia and Holland is not loosened and that Dutch authority in Indonesia will remain the basis on which further development of both partners will take place.'
b. Van Rijckevorsel:
   'It is very probable, that a world war would break out about our succession and in any case the Dutch Indies could not remain independent; some foreign colonial power would undertake the task that Holland would have lost and Indonesia would soon find out that not every change in government is necessarily

an improvement. There are no grounds for assuming that other powers would make more of a success of it than Holland. On the contrary! But we do not want such contingencies to come about. We want to prevent them, because we as *true Dutchmen* do *not want to see the kingdom reduced.* And that is why in finding the right answer for the present problem the unity of the whole kingdom must be our prime objective. We must not endanger the unity.'

c. *Memorandum in Reply to the First Chamber*:
'Though this law does not in the least promote the independence of Indonesia from Holland, it will give Indonesia *independence only to the extent which enables the bond with Holland to be retained.*'

d. De Waal Malefijt:
'In the colonial paragraph of the anti-revolutionary programme we find among other things: "In the interests of Indonesia great caution is required with regard to anything, which could loosen the *political bond* between Indonesia and Holland".'

e. Jansen:
'We are *not* concerned here with giving Indonesia *independence* from Holland or *even absolute self-government* but we want to go in the direction of more independence.'

Mr. President! I will not comment on these quotations, although there is plenty of reason to do so for this is not the place for it. I only want to emphasise with these quotations the *positive point of view* that Holland, or rather the greater part of the Dutch nation, holds with regard to the potential development of the colony. They do not want to give Indonesia independence from Holland, but even *absolute* self-government such as for instance the English dominions have, they are not willing to consider. The device: 'Je maintiendrai' they are putting into practice liberally 'as true Dutchmen' with regard to the 'continuation of Dutch authority' in Indonesia. They will only give Indonesia the extent of independence permitted by the continuation of the bond with Holland!

However, can one reasonably expect a colony meekly to submit forever enslavement by a foreign ruler? Sooner or later the ideal of a free country will develop among the subjugated people. And once the ideal is born it is immortal. And since 1913 the reclamation of national freedom has set in in Indonesia.

Thus we see two forces which move in opposite directions. We

see here an irreconcilable conflict of interests which one day will turn into a conflict of power and which sooner or later will inevitably lead to a violent clash.

Perhimpoenan Indonesia recognises this inevitable fact. And whether it wants to or not, it cannot but perceive and accept the historical necessity. Whether it wants to or not, the Indonesian people will regain its freedom sooner or later. This is the evolutionary law of human society. Professor Wilbur C. Abbott, a well-known Professor of *Harvard University* once wrote:
'Democracy is a kind of revolution; freedom was gained by violence and it was agreed upon long ago, that man had the right to offer violent resistance and even to die, if their grievances seemed intolerable. One should not forget Cromwell, the Jacobeans and the Sons of Freedom. One should not forget either, that it is the right and duty of the existing order to defend itself and that one cannot expect protection from the laws which one rejects, or hide behind a system which one would like to destroy. Violence is thus no proof.'[108]

This Professor also points out the clash of wills and the clash of power! Convinced of the truth that national liberation can only be achieved by violence, *Indonesia Merdeka* says:
'We know that it is the spirit of the time that pronounces a new order which will probably not be born without the throes of childbirth. It seems inevitable that violence will be the midwife of this society. Necessity pushes us in that direction; a peaceful solution of conflicts could only be achieved, if man can moderate his selfish interests in personal gain. This would imply an elimination of one's own interests, a self-denial which we cannot expect from the Westerner, with his materialistic nature, which derives its strength rather from *power* than from *justice*'.[109]

Mr. President! I can only establish these facts and predict the course of events. By facing the facts, Perhimpoenan Indonesia *sees the problem as it really is.* And referring to that inevitable and fatal moment and to the inexorable operation of the historical laws, *Indonesia Merdeka* says:
'More than ever we now know the only road that leads to freedom. It is the road of struggle, of sacrifices, of suffering. At the moment we know no other way; at least we *see* no other that leads to our goal. The road is not new, it is old in the history of man. Only via purgatory can we reach paradise.'[110]

Violence in the solution of the colonial problem can *only be avoided* if one of the parties will change its view. Holland for

instance would have to give up its principle of the continuation of Dutch authority in Indonesia. And, as we have seen, this is contrary to the Dutch colonial ideal. Or on the other hand Indonesia would have to give in and accept the situation of limited independence within the framework of the Dutch empire. One could hardly expect of us, Indonesian nationalists, that we should give up our ideal of a free country, just as one would not expect it of the Dutch of the 16th-17th century or the beginning of the last century. Briefly *Indonesia Merdeka* formulates this point of view as follows: 'We would rather see Indonesia sink to the bottom of the sea, than suffer it to be an eternal appendix of some other foreign nation.'[111]

Mr. President! It should be obvious now that one cannot identify the fact that we establish and foresee a future violent clash, with propagating the idea of violence, neither can it be qualified as 'deliberate propaganda for violent action against the regime'. *Violence* is no criterion for judging Perhimpoenan Indonesia. For the Indonesian *moderates*, who through thick and thin want to cooperate with the ruler, are also *convinced* that the ultimate liberation of Indonesia from the Dutch yoke will only be brought about by violence.'[112]

I say 'moderates', for we fiercely reject the grouping of Indonesian political parties according to European classification. The Indonesian movement knows no 'left' or 'right'. It only knows revolutionary nationalists or non-cooperators, moderate nationalists or moderate and non-nationalists.[113]

The difference between the non-cooperators and the moderates only lies in the means which they think should be used in order to achieve the ultimate objective. For the moderates *believe* in the 'good faith' of the ruler. Although they too, realise that, as they themselves witnessed in the Parliamentary Debate of 1925, the chances of unconditional autonomy, for which they are prepared to cooperate with the ruler, are at present nil, they also *believe* that the time will come when liberal views will prevail. We revolutionary nationalists dare not set our hopes on it. That is why we go our own way, which I have set out here: the way of *self-activity*.

So this is the similarity and the differences between the nationalists of Perhimpoenan Indonesia and the moderates! Violence is not a *determining* factor in the struggle of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. It only knows one kind of violence. And that is the ultimate means which the Indonesian people as an organised unity, will at one time wield to regain its freedom. In the same spirit *Indonesia*

Merdeka speaks, when it deals with the 'national claims':
'It was not forgotten however that blood and tears would be shed for the recapture of the Fatherland. That much they had learned from the history of the laws of liberation of every oppressed nation. And that is when revolution was idealised as the ultimate means. But as regards the nation one felt obliged to prevent this bloodshed as much as possible. And if it were not possible to escape this iron fate, which not a single oppressed nation has been able to do so far, then they wanted to wait to the last moment, until they had come to the gate of the promised land. Then the decisive battle would be fought, for there was no other way left, if the enemy continued to deny them admittance through the only gate. But before it had come to that, all means must be employed which would not lead to bloodshed.'[114]

Thus said *Indonesia Merdeka*! It is clear now, what position Perhimpoenan Indonesia takes up about the problem of violence.

At the most one could claim, that Perhimpoenan Indonesia, because of its principles and methods of resistance, has helped to accelerate the coming of the inevitable moment of a violent clash. For by its propaganda for national unity and solidarity, for *non-cooperation* and *self-help*, it greatly expedites the development of self-respect and political awareness of the Indonesian masses. This hastens the power formation of the Indonesian masses, the development of a self-assertive, nationalist mass action and finally the rate at which we are approaching the moment of the ultimate question of power. At that point, Holland will be faced with two *alternatives* to withdraw from Indonesia *voluntarily* or *to be thrown out.*

We hope, Mr. President, that one day people here in Holland will wake up to the harsh reality. We hope that, when the moment of the power question has come, Holland will choose to withdraw voluntarily, which can only benefit the existing *economic* relations between Holland and Indonesia, but they will then be free relations. We hope that the selfishness in the heart of the Dutch nation, *for their own sake*, will be replaced by idealism. That is what we hope . . ., but we fear that things will turn out differently. The present political trends in Holland, in which more than 70% are of the opinion that Dutch authority in Indonesia must be maintained, gives little indication, that Holland will make a sensible choice. It will maintain itself until is is thrown out.

This is unfortunetaly the *psychology* of all rulers – world history will prove it – that they always make the wrong choice. Up to the

last moment they will think, that they are powerful enough to turn the rising tide of nationalism. And Holland will be no exception. But is has this other very unfavourable factor against it, namely that the greater part of its civil service consists of Indonesian elements which are not immune to the germs of nationalism.

a. *The cycle of the colonial period*

Mr. President! If we follow the cycle of the colonial period, you will see that in the first stage after the conquest of the colony the authority of the coloniser was maintained only by violence. Again in the second stage, the authorities find support for their violence in the law. The colony is then given a constitution to which the population has to conform. The reasons for the creation of a law can be manifold, one of them being fear of foreign intervention. But in the meanwhile the insight of the colonised is beginning to develop. With this growth of nationalism the third stage sets in. The nationalists now come up with demands for freedom of association and want to have a say in the country's government. The ruler is forced to pacify them a little, by giving them a fake parliament. But in the long run this does not satisfy them. The nationalists make more and more demands, finally they demand complete autonomy as a step towards absolute independence. This however the ruler will not give them and thus we find a conflict of interests between the ruler and the ruled. And with this the *fourth* stage sets in. We then find a continual clash of ideas until in the end the ruled lose confidence in the ruler and want to go their own way from then on. The conflict between ruler and ruled is sharpening every day. Then the *fifth* period sets in in which the ruler returns to *violence* to maintain his authority against the rising stream of nationalism. Then we get a period of great complications. The build-up of power among the oppressed is steadily increasing and finally comes to a head, when *the* power question is asked which gives the ruler two alternatives. His short-sightedness prevents him from seeing the precarious nature of his situation. He aims at a violent clash, with the result that he himself is thrown out of the colony.

Mr. President! If I outline this development, I have not the least intention of developing some kind of colonial historical idealism. I am merely stating the facts as they appear to me from colonial history. It is curious that the same phenomena return again and again.

Maybe a practical illustration is needed. Let us take the development of the colonial history of Holland with regard to Indonesia. The *first* period was the longest one here. Until the middle of the last century Indonesian territory was ruled on the strength of *power* alone, it was a police state in the purest sense of the word. Only in 1854 the *second* period set in, when Indonesia was given its government regulations, a would-be law, in which the power of the ruler was defined. That was the period in which the government was supposed to be supported by the 'law'. But that was only pretence, for government absolutism continued undisturbed. The population had no influence at all on the making of the laws. Political societies were absolutely forbidden. However, a change set in when in 1912 Indonesian nationalism arose. This was the beginning of the *third* period. The growth of the national movement has been so forceful, that the Indonesians have succeeded in extorting from the ruler the right of association and public meetings. In the beginning, the Indonesian people had a strong feeling of impotence, due to the indoctrination over years of their inferiority and of the excellent qualities of the West. All they wanted was to have a say in the country's government. They wanted a parliament, in which they could cooperate with the government on the welfare of their own country. Thanks to the power of the national movement Indonesia was given a General Council. But very soon they realised that this was only a means to 'keep the baby quiet'. And then there was the demand for a real parliament followed by the famous November promise. The promise which for the ruler already went too far but which was granted out of fear. Then there followed the repudiation of the November promise. A conflict of interests arose between the ruler and the ruled. Around the same time Mr. Fock's reactionary government came into power. The fourth stage in this development was the period of the non-cooperation movements. From now on they wanted to achieve their objectives by relying on their own powers and abilities. It was growing in dimension. The exasperation of the people grew. The racial conflict was growing more acute every day. And then there was the period in which the Indonesian government, under the leadership of Mr. Fock, returned to *violence*. And so we came to the fifth period, which was full of complications. This brings us to the present!

I have explained in some detail how the government of Mr. Fock used violence to break down every act of national resistance. And we saw how this hardline policy ended in a fatal drama in West

Java and on Sumatra's West Coast. How the further development of political life in Indonesia will turn out, is obviously difficult to predict.

But it is certain that the coming period will be full of great events. But whether the failure of the November riots of 1926 will bring a period of peace and order for some time to come in the colonial community, we do not know. Before these November riots there had been dozens of rebellions in Indonesia; they will certainly not cease in the future. In the meanwhile the development of politics in the future will be dominated to a greater extent by the following factors: on the one hand the tact of the Indonesian government and its sense of truth, and on the other hand the development of the internal powers of the Indonesia people.

b. *The problem of the future*

Mr. President! I have already said that a militant spirit had entered the Indonesian people as a result of the trrror measures of the Indies Government. After years of suffering and endurance the Indonesian People's conscience has been awakened. May the event of recent times be a warning beacon to the Indies Government not to proceed with its terror measures. They have it entirely within their power to steer the process of nationalism, even if it follows its own course. If the Government is really intent on seeing a healthy development of the Indonesian nationalist movement, it will be their very first duty to restore to the Indonesian People the right to hold meetings and establish societies. For one cannot deliberately violate a right that the people have always enjoyed. The *right* to form societies and the right of *mass protest*[115] is an inherent part of the Indonesian community, and these have always formed one of the most important pillars of Indonesian democracy. Since olden times they have formed the primary foundations of Indonesian village life. Indeed, village structure without the right of meetings is unthinkable. One cannot violate these basic principles of law, which are deeply rooted in the conscience of the Indonesian People. Many experts in the field of Indonesian public law have continually pointed this out to the Indies Government, but they do not seem to care. During the French Revolution it was formulated clearly and strongly: 'When a government violates the rights of a people then the revolution is for that people and for

each part of that people the most holy right and the most inexorable of all duties. The laws of its conscience are higher than all the laws of a state put together. One must obey that conscience and not the State when both clash. 'La sûreté et la résistance à l'oppression . . . sont les droits naturels et imprescriptibles de l'homme. (Declaration of Human Rights).'[116]

In this statement lies the origin of modern European democracy. Although this principle is acknowledged for their own country, they believe that different principles should apply in the Colonies. But they forget that the oppressed people will finally make their own laws when their rights are denied them. It is a fatal mistake to think that they can for ever impose their will on the Indonesian People. Their sense of justice will grow stronger with every day that passes. Just as in a free country, the famous statement of Prof. Krabbe will not fail to have its effect in the long run in Indonesia. The statement runs as follows:

'Therefore the legislator *cannot* monopolise the making of laws. It is true that sometimes a legislator has interposed his authority, but it has had no real significance, for the sense of justice of the people, as soon as legal justice is no longer in keeping with its will, will express itself differently. The spiritual power at work in the sense of justice of the people cannot be deprived of its force by the words of one man. Where it cannot formally destroy it will undermine, and the will of the legislator, be it painted on parchment or chiselled into stone tablets, will have but a hollow sound, as the history of all ages shows, if it does not strike an answering chord in the soul of man.'[117]

Krabbe wrote his book for a country that had already been founded on a modern democracy with a well-developed parliamentary system. Even in such a country he believes it to be possible for this 'spiritual power' to manifest itself in spite of the written laws. But that same power will operate with re-doubled force in a colony like Indonesia, where no rights exist and only the power of the authorities applies. As we have already seen, the popular movement developed into an underground action when the Government stifled every strong expression of the popular sense of justice by tyrannical means.

Freedom of the press and unlimited right of association and assembly are the necessary conditions for a healthy development of the national movement in Indonesia. Keen opposition is inevitable in a country with an autocratic colonial government and where the

wishes and demands of the people are ignored. The government of Mr. Fock feared open opposition, but they forgot that underground activity was even more dangerous for them! More than a century ago the Belgian expert on constitutional law Guizot had pleaded for the right of opposition to authority, and the colonial government would be well advised to pay heed to his words. He said among other things:

'There exists an instinctive feeling for justice and right in the depths of every human soul. One does not oppose single or multiple tyranny because one has the power to do so, but because one has a right against it. That is the *conscience of justice and right*; in other words of a law independent of human will, a conscience which is often dimmed, but always powerful, and which sooner or later raises up and sustains men against all tyranny, whatever its name or form.'[118]

However, the tyranny in Indonesia is still continuing, thanks to the smear campaign of the white press.

'We, in a colonial society', says *Indonesia Merdeka*, 'know very well that they measure with two standards. It is always our party which gets the worst of it when it turns to the established government.'[119] But the Indonesian People have woken up for good, thanks to their miserable conditions and thanks to the tyranny of the authorities. The 'gentlest people' on earth have become rebellious; they cannot be defied any longer. For the 'spiritual power' of Krabbe and the 'conscience sometimes dimmed, but always powerful' of Guizot will dominate the Indonesian masses still more in the future. And the violent measures of the colonial government will only serve as a red rag to the masses, who will now stick at nothing.

The slogan 'Netherlands, take care' is often proclaimed in this country by those who encourage the colonial government to continue their iron-fisted policy. From this platform I want to hurl back the same words at them and to point out at the same time that the 'Netherlands interest' will not be served by arbitrariness and a show of force against the increasing tide of Indonesian nationalism, but rather will it have the opposite effect! *That the Dutch domination of Indonesia is coming to an end is a foregone conclusion for me.* It is merely a question of time, sooner or later, not yes or no. The Dutch people will have to accept this iron law of history, whether they like it or not. And let the Netherlands not cherish the illusion that their colonial power will stand for ever. Let the

colonial government not continue with their terror measures because they may in the end create a situation which will have detrimental effects on the Dutch trade in colonial goods!

This is all very fine, but the population of millions in Indonesia is being ill-treated in the name of the Dutch People and of Dutch civilisation!

9. CONCLUSIONS

Speech before the Court of Justice on the 9th March 1928

Your Worships, Mr. President and Judges!

I have prepared a long defence for which I would have to crave your attention for about $3^1/_2$ hours. But I will save your valuable time by handing over my plea to you. In addition I wish to state that I am entirely in agreement with what my advisers Mr. Mobach and Mr. Duys so excellently argued yesterday.

But now I wish to enlighten you briefly on one item, viz. the attitude of Perhimpoenan Indonesia towards violence. Neither in its statutes nor in its declaration of principles is there contained any element of violence. It has never desired violent action. So it has never advocated violence. But it has talked about violence.

As a result of an analysis of colonial relations, Perhimpoenan Indonesia has reached the conclusion that these relations are governed to an excessive degree by two opposing forces, namely the standpoint of the Netherlands, which states that the colony must be retained at all costs, and Indonesia's striving for complete independence. And this has led it to the conclusion that the independence of Indonesia can only be secured by violence. But this is not a staggering discovery. For missionaries and parliamentarians have reached the same conclusion, as was demonstrated yesterday by quotations used by Mr. Duys. It is, after all, a law of history that the birth of a people always involves blood and tears. *Indonesia Merdeka* writes as follows on this (1924, p. 1):

'Every oppressed people will sooner or later recapture its freedom; that is the iron law of world history. Only the circumstances in which the freedom movement develops are determined by the attitude of those who hold the reins of power. It mainly depends on them whether the birth of freedom will be accompanied by blood and tears, or whether it will be accomplished by a peaceful route.'

Thus the Netherlands has it entirely within its own power to determine in what way Indonesia will become free, by violent means or by the path of peace. But when one considers the attitude of the great majority of the Dutch People, which is clearly typified by the debates in Parliament during 1925 on the Constitutional Law of the Dutch East Indies, it is to be feared that the former course will be followed.

I am convinced that the Dutch domination is coming to its end. It is merely a question of time and not of whether or no. Let the Netherlands no longer imagine that its colonial power will last for ever!

There is just one more point I wish to touch upon, Mr. President, namely our preventive detention. We do not stand here as criminals, but we are honourable people who are standing up for our convictions. You may therefore believe what I have to say.

Our preventive detention is always justified by 'fear of escape'. Escape, Mr. President? We are too proud to flee. We fight for a high ideal and fleeing would only damage our cause. Our convictions are doubtless not yours, but one thing we can have for each other, since we are no criminals: that is respect for each other's convictions. That respect would also make you realise that escaping is the last thing we could do.

But I don't want to talk only in abstract terms, but to offer you concrete proofs in order to convince you that the so-called motive of 'fear of escape' is absolutely without foundation. If I had ever thought of escaping then the Dutch judicature would never have been able to lay hands on me. I was safe in Switzerland when the persecution started with the raid on our people. And I would have stayed there if I had had any fear of criminal proceedings. On the contrary! Precisely with a view to our trial in public which, as I surmised, is to take place at the end of September, I cut short my holiday abroad and soon returned to the Netherlands. These three of my compatriots were also on holiday abroad. Had they thought of fleeing, what would have been easier for them than to remain where they were? But, Mr. President, our honour forbids us to be cowards. Nevertheless our honourable behaviour was repaid with five and a half months behind bars.

The motive of 'fear of escape' is utterly untenable. And for this reason I now urge you most strongly to end our preventive detention at once, pending your further judgment of our case. I believe that you will also administer justice in this matter.

As I am abstaining from making a lengthy plea, Mr. President, allow me here to read only the conclusion of that speech:

Your Worships!

Now that I have come to the end of my defence, I would for a moment like to make use of my position as Defendant to make a complaint against the *injustice* which is continuously perpetrated against my people. To you, as the servants of law and justice, I put my question as to whether you wish to sanction the illegal deed of the Netherlands Government against the defenceless Indonesian students of Perhimpoenan Indonesia. We have been persecuted for years in this country by all possible means. We thought that we would enjoy, in the land of Grotius, where people boast of the basic rights of the free citizen, the same elementary rights. But no! As nothing could be undertaken against us in this country through the lawcourts, they availed themselves of immoral measures in order to be able to get at us. Our parents in Indonesia were prohibited from sending their student sons in Europe any further money if they remained members of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, and they were threatened with dismissal from government service or other arbitrary measures.

This measure is a double-edged sword. On the one hand the sons, living in the midst of a foreign community, are reduced to wretched conditions, and on the other hand a conflict is provoked between father and son, between the older generation and the younger generation. 'There exists a strained relationship between an older and a younger generation as it is, without this threat. Even without that gap father and son live in different spheres. The elder generation, rooted in tradition, and feeling the evening of life approach, tends to conserve what exists, and stands confronting a young life, which acclaims the red morning light, and whose soul is afire with the new things still to come. Conviction is too strong, faith is too alive in young hearts to be suffocated. The love and passion lie too deep for the young generation not to be prepared, albeit with bleeding hearts, to sever blood ties in order to save their faith'.[120]

But that does not remove the fact, Mr. President that this means of provocation, this means of punishing some of the Indonesian students here with misery and want is an injustice and a crime!

I ask you with confidence, Your Worships, representatives of the law, whether this is not an indirect method of taking away our freedom of movement in this country which is contrary to constitu-

tional freedom? Will it not create more bitterness in us, if we are made to feel – in the most arbitrary way and even in violation of the law – how pitiable it is to belong to a people in bondage? It is made all too clear to us, the sons of a colonised people, that legal security for us is nowhere to be found.

But the Indonesians of Perhimpoenan Indonesia know how to suffer in the same way as the youth of all colonised peoples must suffer. The sun does not shine on their youth like it does on the sons of a free people. In their youth they must put up with hardship and sacrifices. But all this only strengthens their spirit and character in the fight for the ideal which beckons and calls. The mysterious call of the Indonesion masses has touched them and it is with those masses that they want to fight.

We believe in the future of our people and we have confidence in their inner powers. We know that the balance of power in Indonesia is continually shifting to our advantage. 'It is said', says Indonesia Merdeka[121] 'that our people which was great in the past would not be capable of greatness in the future; that it would be impossible to reverse the declining trend. We must not judge our people; history will do that. We will either be sentenced or acquitted with our people. Because with that people we will gain respect or we will perish with it. The Indonesian Youth is an inseparable part of the Indonesian people, that suffers and hopes. Their speaking conscience, their burning soul, colour the future.

The red radiance of the future already begins to dawn in the present. We greet it as the dawn of a new day. Indonesia's Youth must help to steer us in the right direction. Its task will be to hasten the advent of the new day. It will have to teach our people the joy of living; not misery alone should be its part. May the Indonesian people feel free under their blue sky and may they feel themselves masters in the land God gave them.'

Your Worships!

Now that I stand prepared for your judgment on our movement, the words of René de Clercq, who chose Young Indonesia as his guide, come to my lips:

'There is but one country that can be mine,
It grows to the deed, and that deed is mine.'

Plea before the Court of Justice in The Hague, 9th March 1928.

1. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3-4, 1926, p. 64.
2. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1925, p. 39.
3. Quoted by Siegf. Polak: *Beknopte geschiedenis der Staathuishoudkunde in theorie en practijk*, part II, p. 49.
4. *Het Nederlandsch Staatsrecht*, part I, p. 48.
5. Prof. Mr. van der Vlugt: *Belangrijkste geschriften*, p. 138.
6. See *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 30.
7. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1924, p. 37 *et sqq.*
8. *Gedenkboek der Indonesische Vereniging 1908-1923*, p. 11.
9. *Loc. cit.*, p. 12.
10. *Loc. cit.*, p. 13.
11. *Loc. cit.*, p. 13.
12. *Loc. cit.*, p. 15.
13. Quoted in *loc. cit.*, p. 16.
14. *Loc. cit.*, p. 16.
15. *Loc. cit.*, p. 17.
16. *Loc. cit.*, p. 17.
17. These texts of the declarations of the Government of the Netherlands East Indies are not to be found in my original plea, because I did not have them in my cell during my preventive detention. In order to give a clearer insight in the November promise I have inserted them here, copied from the address of Mr. J. E. W. Duys.
18. In the original copy I have reproduced this passage in my own words from the speech of the Regent Djajadiningrat. But I think it better to quote his own words here, copied from the proceedings of the National Council 1924, p. 138.
19. I quote from memory. The speech was held in Malayan and recently inserted in the Weltevreden daily *Bintang Timoer*, from which I have taken cognizance of that speech.
20. This outspoken Demang is now, apparently as punishment for his too great courage in denouncing the colonial truth, transferred from Padang Pandjang to Air Bangis, a small place in the North-West corner on the West Coast of Sumatra, which is really not a place for a first-class demang like him.
21. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1924, p. 29.
22. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1924, p. 26.
23. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1924, p. 40 *et sqq.*
24. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1924, p. 41.
25. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 9.
26. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 9, 1925, p. 126 *et sqq.*
27. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 9, 1925, p. 127.
28. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1-2, 1927, p. 37.
29. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3-4, 1926, p. 65.
30. See *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, evening edition, 17 November 1926, quoted by *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1-2, 1927, p. 45.
31. *De Opbouw*, no. 2, 9th annual edition.
32. This is the case of Soetan Said Ali, when he protested during a public meeting in Padang against the introduction of the groundrent system on the West Coast of Sumatra, because this violates the *Plakat Pandjang* (i.e. a contract between the Government and the Minangkabau people) and which results in practice in increased taxation.
33. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 5.
34. See plea of Mr. J. E. W. Duys, *De vervolging tegen de Indonesische Studenten*, pp. 25-36 (Footnote added later).

35. See *Indonesia Merdeka*, nos. 3-4, 1926, p. 40 *et sqq.*
36. *Indonesia Merdeka*, nos. 1-2, 1927, p. 40.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
38. See *De Economist*, 1926, pp. 264-269.
39. *Loc. cit.*, p. 263.
40. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1-2, 1927, p. 10.
41. cf. *De Economist*, 1926, p. 639.
42. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1-2, 1927, p. 44.
43. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1927, p. 44.
44. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 30.
45. *De Economist*, 1926, p. 573.
46. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 7 *et sqq.*
47. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 7 *et sqq.*
48. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 8, 1925, p. 115.
49. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 6.
50. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 8, 1925, p. 115.
51. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3-4, 1926, p. 39.
52. Kranenburg, *Het Nederlandsch Staatsrecht I*, p. 97.
53. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1924, p. 22.
54. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 5.
55. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 8, 1925, p. 109.
56. Roman Rolland, *Mahatma Gandhi*, p. 180: 'Half a century ago Force had priority over Justice. Now it is still worse: Force *is* Justice. The one has devoured the other.'
57. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 5.
58. Kleintjes: *Staatsinstellingen van Ned.-Indië I*, 5th imp., p. 119.
    Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, 'Vergeten Jubilé', reprint from article in *De Gids.*
59. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1-2, 1927, p. 7.
60. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 4-5, 1927, p. 100.
61. Presidential speech on acceptance of the chairmanship of *Perhimpoenan Indonesia*, on 17th January 1926, published in Dutch Perhimpoenan Indonesia, The Hague, *cf. supra*, Ch. 3.
62. See my *Economic World Structure*, *supra*, Ch. 3.
    Also: Stibbe, *Inleiding tot de kennis der bestuursinstellingen in vreemde koloniën*; also Prof. Moresco, *Koloniale Politiek*, inaugural speech, Rotterdam.
63. Italics of the provisional report.
64. Quoted by *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1-2, 1927, p. 51.
65. Quoted in *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 26 *et sqq.*
66. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 27.
67. See *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1924, p. 23.
68. In my original defence plea presented to the court I had represented the expressions shown in inverted commas above in my own words. But now that I have access to these passages, pronounced by the East Indies Government in 1918 in the National Council, I think it is preferable to quote these expressions verbatim.
69. *La mise en valeur des colonies françaises*, p. 85 *et sqq.*
70. Dr. Jan Romein *Inleiding tot Jan Christoffel*, p. 18.
71. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1924, p. 38.
72. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3-5, 1925, p. 54.
73. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3-4, 1926, p. 66.
74. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1926, p. 84.
75. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1925, p. 42.
76. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1927, p. 70.
77. *Indië's Toekomst*, p. 12.

78. The italics are mine.
79. 'Aanslag op Leiden'. The authors are the Professors C. Van Vollenhoven, A. W. Nieuwenhuis, C. Snouck Hurgronje, Ph. S. van Ronkel, H. F. Colenbrander, G. A. J. Hazeu and N. H. Krom.
80. Quoted in *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3, 1927, p. 70.
81. Kranenburg, *Het Nederlandsch Staatsrecht II*, p. 117.
82. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 7-8, 1924, p. 115.
83. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 7-8, 1924, p. 130.
84. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 7-8, 1924, p. 132.
85. Compare Professor Dr. A. H. Hollmann, Dänische Volkshochschule. This school is called a *college* because it concerns itself with the higher things that move a society and it is called *people's* because it is directed to the whole of the population and only deals with subjects that concern the whole population. Its objective is to create a national culture, with some peaks rising far above the others, according to human nature, but whose foundations are homogenous and within the reach of all. However, the road leading to that goal is the development of personality for an awareness of culture, for an awareness of culture can only arise from the inner freedom of the personality. In order to cultivate this higher communal sense, man must first be liberated from the burden of the masses; he must be able to choose, in freedom, according to the nature of his own being. And that is why the inner freedom of the personality is the fundamental law of this school. It does not want to create submissive people, it does not want to clothe the mind in uniform, but it wants to educate the people to be mature members of society. In one word: the spirit of this people's college is the spirit of democracy; therefore it is diametrally opposed to the philosophy and the government policy with which we have lived so far and the sad results of which we now see around us'.

    ('Democratische cultuur-idealen', from *Wetenschappelijke bladen* of 1921, p. 230 *et sqq.*).

    This note did not occur in the original text, but has been added later. I've added it to give the reader some idea of what is meant by 'people's college'.
86. 'Democratische cultuur-idealen' in *Wetenschappelijke bladen*, 1921, p. 231.
87. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 7-8, 1924, p. 115 *et sqq.*
88. For the account of this see *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 27th March, 1925.
89. Quoted in *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 28.
90. Quoted in *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 4-5, 1927, p. 86.
91. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 7-8, 1924, p. 114.
92. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 8, 1925, p. 106.
93. *Cf. supra*, p. 52 *et sqq.*
94. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 7-8, 1924, p. 109 *et sqq.*
95. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1926, p. 1.
96. *Indonesia Merdeka*, ditto.
97. See my introduction to the report of the Sixth International Democratic Congress at Bierville, read to the General Meeting of Perhimpoenan Indonesia on October 18th 1926, included in the dossier (*of the documents in the case*).
98. Kranenburg, *Het Nederlandsch Staatsrecht I*, p. 341.
99. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 3-4, 1926, p. 64.
100. Clive Day, *Nederlandsch Beheer over Java gedurende drie eeuwen*, p. 461 *et sqq.*
101. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 4-5, 1925, p. 61.
102. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 36.
103. See my letter of the 2nd June 1926 to a representative of Perhimpoenan

Indonesia in Indonesia, included in the dossier (of the documents in the case).

104. Letter of a representative of the P.I. in Indonesia, of the 7th Februari 1927, included in the dossier (of the documents in the case).
105. Compare my introduction to the accounts of the sixth international democratic conference at Bierville, read to the General Meeting of Perhimpoenan Indonesia on the 18th October 1926, included in the dossier (of the documents in the case).
106. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 1, 1924, p. 1.
107. *Cf. supra*, p. 253.
108. Article in the *Atlantic Monthly* of June 1922, quoted in the *Wetenschappelijke bladen* in 1922 under the title 'Individualisme en Socialisme'.
109. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 25.
110. *Indonesia Merdeka*, nos. 4 and 5, 1925, p. 53.
111. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1926, p. 106.
112. Cf. my 'Economic World Structure and the Conflict of Power', *supra*, Ch. 3.
113. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 4-5, 1925, p. 59.
114. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 2, 1925, p. 33 *et sqq*.
115. Cf. Van Vollenhoven, *Het Adatrecht van Ned.-Indië I*, p. 530 *et sqq*.
116. See *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1926, p. 84 *et sqq*.
117. Krabbe, *Die Lehre der Rechtssouveränität*, p. 175, referred to in Kranenburg, *Het Nederlandsch Staatsrecht*, p. 69.
118. Guizot, *Histoire des origines du gouvernement représentatif I*, p. 68; referred to in Kranenburg, *Het Nederlandsch Staatsrecht I*, p. 198.
119. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1926, p. 84.
120. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1926, p. 85.
121. *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 5-6, 1926, p. 85.

12 National claims

'Le devoir de la jeunesse est de prendre en mains les destinées de l'humanité, parce que, seul elle a la vigueur, la conscience, l'enthousiasme et que seul elle peut faire de la liberté une réligion'. Joseph Mazzini

Those who believed in the Wilsonian 'gospel': 'peace without victory and self-determination of the nations' and who, therefore, believed that a new period of good fortune was already dawning on the horizon of the severely stricken old world, will now, almost six years after the war, be convinced of the misleading slogans of the preachers of harmony. For what else has peace created but a troubled political atmosphere, full of new conflicts? Did not the gentlemen of Versailles go too much by selfish motives instead of thinking a moment of the destiny of humanity which was in their hands at the time? After four years of terrible manslaughter, of 'immense waste of life and property, of passion and sacrifice, of suffering and energy' they could not decide to use all powers available for the reconstruction of society and for the national production of economic goods, of which there was and still is a great need. The decline of the annual world production resulting from this loss is, according to Walther Rathenau's estimation, at least fifteen thousand million goldmarks, not much less than Europe's collective economisation before the war.

'Beside the enormous sacrifices of human lives they lost socially: raw materials, semi-manufactured articles and goods that were available at the beginning of the war'.[1] Adding to this the losses of the war itself, amounting to more than 900 thousand millions the precarious situation of the world economy is totally clear. Furthermore, there is an incredible decline in intellectual activity. Apparently they did not worry too much about these alarming social losses. In the minds of the leading politicians of that time there was no room left for the idea of economic reconstruction of the world.

Politics, and especially self-interested politics, is the pivot on which everything turns. And the first signs of these self-interested politics manifest themselves in the Treaty of Versailles itself. Though the old irredenta problems have, as far as they are advantageous to the victors, been banished from the political world-scene, new problems crop up, threatening the structure of European society with another collapse. The formerly accused nations now claim their national 'mortgages' in their turn. Instead of French, Italian and Slav Irredentas we see German, Hungarian, Russian, Bulgarian and Turkish claims. A part of their nation is arbitrarily accomodated in foreign countries. 'Such conditions are mere wounds in the political system and later it depends on subjective factors whether these wounds heal of their own accord or remain open until they are healed perhaps through surgical intervention.'[2]

The new era that has begun with 'the victory of justice over sheer force' is full of hate and egoism. There is no question of justice instead of power. The ancient law of the jungle was apparently the guiding principle of the Treaty of Versailles, a principle making a mockery of all rules of ethics and justice. Where is the Wilsonian gospel of 'peace without victory' and 'self-determination'? The preacher himself was too weak to put his principle into practice. Was it surprising then, when the vanquished parties that had put so much confidence in the strict performance of Wilson's 14 proposals reacted strongly against their wrongful application? Crushed by war, they could not reinforce their protest by rattling sabres.

But the feeling of resentment is growing. The only exception is Turkey, which used armed force to gain respect for its national claims. But we will talk about that later!

The discontent is not confined only to the nations defeated during the world war. The colonised nations have also become the victims of an unfulfilled promise. When, in 1917, popular fury made the unstable structure of the Russian 'ancien régime' collapse, on the ruins of which Lenin and Trotsky built a new society of a completely different structure, this method found a response in several regions of the globe, especially in the oppressed countries. But the cunning rulers, seeing the imminent hurricane, could soothe the feelings of the claimants of justice with their fine November promises, i.e., promises of changing the untenable constitutional situation. Then the oppressed nations believed that the Wilsonian doctrine of self-determination would be put into practice. But as soon as the storm subsided the solemn promises were forgotten.

This is the situation after the World War! The defeated try to get an existence worthy of a human being, in accordance with the Wilsonian principle of 'self-determination', the victors want to draw all power to themselves and besides think that they have the right to determine other people's destiny. The colonised nations demand the fulfilment of what has been promised; the unscrupulous rulers deny their own words. Thus there is a struggle between ideals and ethics, i.e., western ethics. This is bound to lead to a conflict of will. Side by side we see the display of the power of one party and the will of the other party, a strong desire to have freedom of movement along with other nations. So this new era is an era of conflict between power and will.

Under this political sky we see the rebirth of a nationalism that is no longer merely a profession of the ideal of freedom, but is particularly characterised by confidence in its own capacities. After all these political trickeries they realise that their own existence is only safeguarded by their own resources. The old slogan for freedom, once voiced by the Italian movement for national unity and liberty 'allora l'Italia potrà fara da se',[3] is now again the cherished motto of the nations suffering from injustice. The modern method of warfare – already well-known in history – is in Victor Hugo's words: 'ne plus prier, ne plus croire, c'est être fort'.

Already history teaches us that in this political situation the only way to achieve one's purpose is to set one's own power against that of the oppressors. It is unnecessary to look for examples in Antiquity, the Middle Ages or in the last century; it is enough to look at the recent developments in Ireland and Turkey. They teach us what the will of the people means and what can be achieved by united action. We need not remind someone who reads the newspapers regularly of these recent movements for freedom. However, we cannot refrain from mentioning a few essential cases, from which we can learn much. The recognition of Ireland's Independence as a Dominion is the triumph after a long struggle. For those who are in the same position it is worth thinking about the enormous sacrifices and the weapons used by the Irish nationalists to achieve their ultimate ideal. And because it concerned a clash of interests between England and Ireland, between the desire to be free and the desire to retain imperialistic power, cooperation between parties was absolutely impossible. The leader of the Sinn-Fein movement, Arthur Griffith, realised this quite well, when he proclaimed the passive resistance slogan of the nationalist struggle.

Thus unnecessary waste of time and energy was prevented. '*Organising* and *constructing* their own country, the advocates of passive resistance have to refuse any form of support to the present functioning of the English constitutional system'.[4] But apart from this we see a more important element in Ireland's national struggle. The ideal of freedom was not just a theory; people were really willing to put it into practice.

Armed resistance was chosen as a means of achieving the ideal. This forced England at last to start the negotiations leading to the signing of the Treaty of December, 1921, in which Ireland was recognised as an independent state within the British Empire.

However, by this step the Irish have not achieved what De Valera and his followers had in mind: the total independence of their country. The cause of this set-back was the discord among the Irish people themselves, as it weakened the once-so-strong will, when the door to independence was open. But the fire is yet smouldering.

When we look at Turkey, we see a striking example of what the will of the people can achieve. When Lloyd George in 1919, introduced the modern pilgrimage, i.e., the raid on Turkish economic sources under the cover of a war of independence for the Armenians against the Asiatic barbarians, he had never dreamed that the defeated sick man of Europe would exert such an influence and fill the whole world with amazement. Though one cannot ignore the favourable position of Turkey with regard to Western Europe as an important factor, it was the *internal consolidation* particularly that made the Turkish undertaking a success. Turkey would no longer have existed as an independent nation, if it had acquiesced in the Treaty of Sèvres. The well-known 'Tripartite agreement relating to Anatolia' completed the Allies' demolition of the Ottoman Empire. Turkey escaped by a hair's breadth a situation not very different from that of a colony. The Turkish rescued their country for themselves. We also see here that a people's right to exist is determined and ensured by the Will of the people itself, as written in the 'national pact'. Pascal's words: 'the great ideal is truth' have come true in this case. The character of this new era is clear again, if one realises that for the Turks in their biggest fight for the fulfilment of their national wishes it was the power of arms which settled the matter. This method of claiming justice conducted according to a very high ideal, was justly crowned with success. The direct result of the triumphant victory of the Turkish army was the Greeks giving up their dream of unlimited imperialist

expansion; the indirect result was the defeat of the English Levant policy. The great powers did succeed in demolishing the old wreck of the Ottoman Empire after nine years. But who has a right to the heritage? 'Only the heirs to the Ottoman Empire; they were not the Greeks, nor the Russians, nor the English. They were the Turks themselves'.[5] The acceptance of the Turkish victory was the recognition of the biggest blow England has ever suffered since the loss of its American colonies: 'It was the loss of the East'.[6] England's greatest dream of making Constantinople into another Gibraltar and Asia Minor into a new Egypt, vanished into thin air for ever.

The triumphant victory of the Turks awoke the whole of the East. The booming of Afioun Karahissar's guns sounded to the Asians like a second appeal to reconquer their rightful status, even more quickly. René Grousset says: 'As world issues Afioun Karahissar equalled Mukden and the Treaty of Lausanne that of Portsmouth'.[7]

The Asians are regaining their self-confidence and everywhere they are stirring. They see the star of hope shining again on the Angoran horizon. It was the power of guns and swords, which revived pan-Islamism so strongly. But the modern pan-Islamism is not a campaign against the 'unbelieving', it is a fight for freedom. Hence the full sympathy of the non-Mohammedans in the oppressed countries, where this is taking place. Significant for its character is the fact that it is thriving best of all in those countries where the population is not yet free. In a way, it is a national movement, as proved by the events in Egypt, India, the Philippines, and also our own country. It strikes us immediately that the situation is worst for England. Gradually it will undergo the same sentence as Old Turkey, Old Russia and Austria-Hungary. Some time it will also be called the Sick Man of this part of the world. The speed of the process of liquidation depends on the strength of the claim. Now we see already that the process of decay is steadily spreading in the British Empire. In India the Swarajists have a new political weapon and are not far from revolution. In the Provincial Legislative Councils, in which they form a majority, they practise obstruction by outvoting the budget, except for a sum of two rupees for the cabinet salaries. In this way they try to obstruct the new Constitution, which is not in harmony with the wishes of the Indian people. Thus any cooperation between cabinet and representatives has been made impossible. And when the provincial governors, looking upon this as an emergency case, proceed to autocratic action heedless of the Provincial Legislative Councils, a clash of powers is

inevitable in the natural course of events. One of the Swarajist leaders declared openly that in the event of the governors' abusing their power the people will proceed to 'civil disobedience', refusing to pay taxes. With this weapon the Swarajists have arrived at the brink of social revolution. It is difficult to predict to what extent India is prepared for it. If the pace at which the liquidation of English power over India will take place should slow down, then undoubtedly the moderates, still expecting so much good from cooperation with England, are to blame. Their policy always undermines the actions of Swarajists and of Gandhi, causing suffering to the Indian people who seem compelled to shed more blood in the world than is necessary. But the vital part of the nation is still willing to make the supreme sacrifice for the cause of freedom.

As in India the English cause in Egypt is also becoming more and more hopeless. The Sudan controversy is assuming enormous proportions; everywhere in the country people agitate against English domination. In several towns in the Sudan the cause of freedom is propagated by means of circulars, signed by the Society for the Unity of Sudan and Egypt. At the top of the circulars the slogan of the nationalists is printed in capital letters: 'Blood is more valuable than ink to write the annals of victory and honour'.[8]

The Egyptian nationalists encourage the Sudanese compatriots to persist in their present attitude, to be fearless of the aeroplanes, the munitions of the English army. 'All these things will disappear because of the legitimacy of the people's claims. Though also without arms Egypt managed to force England to recognise its independence. Sudan can do the same'. The most recent news from Egypt[9] tells us that the Egyptian government will refuse any further negotiations with England, if that country does not change its outlook with respect to the Sudan.[10] The political situation is tense!

But England has still more worries. In its mandated country Iraq, the nationalists are stirring, now realising that they have been led astray. The independence they look forward to, is still far away. The Turkish master has been replaced by the English lord. It is easy to understand that the Iraq parliament was not willing at that time to ratify the Anglo-Iraq Treaty. We know what measures forced the parliament eventually to accept the treaty. 'The shootings of Kirhouk (4th May), the bombing of Souleimanieh (24th May) showed how any attempt to offer resistance was punished.'[11] 36 out of 110 representatives cast their votes in regard to the abovementioned Treaty; 25 voted for, 8 abstained from voting, while the

remaining members had not turned up either voluntarily or compulsorily. Is this ratification lawful? These radical methods and the arbitrariness cannot pacify the Iraq nationalists; on the contrary, they embitter them more and more. They cling desperately to their claims to their national mortgage.

Looking at Palestine, which has been a part of the English mandated territories since 1919, we discover symptoms that betray 'something rotten' there too.

We have discussed the numerous offences England has committed concerning the freedom of several nations and peoples. We have tried to indicate the symptoms of disease in the British political system. In Northern Africa, in the Arabian peninsula and in India many charges are laid against England. It is now a matter of what the nature of proceedings will be. The arrival of the day of judgment is accelerated or slowed down according to the force of the claimants. And the verdict will be given as soon as the peoples under England's domination have formed one front against the power of the foreign oppressor. We can already see the process developing in that direction. Mr. Das, leader of the Swarajist movement warns against the present situation in India in an interview with an editor of the Calcutta Statesman: 'The triumph of an anarchistic revolutionary movement will be the inevitable result of the defeat of the autonomist Swarajist movement.

There is no doubt that the anarchist movement in Bengal is much more serious than the authorities believe. If the Swarajist movement fails, there will be no other means left for the people than the violent method of anarchy and revolution'.[12] 'The revolutionaries will soon be at war with England, and its navy, like the Avenger, will not be able to do more than disappear.'[13]

Such is Albion's predicament. But what about our own claims? We will talk about them in a subsequent article.

2

> *Il faillait que la nouvelle forme de l'action fut non seulement politique, mais morale; religieuse en non pas négative; dominée par les principes au lieu de n'obéir qu'à des intérêts; fondée sur le devoir, non sur le bien-être.*
> Joseph Mazzini

After the exposition in our previous article of the claims of various peoples to an independent national existence and of the means

which they use to realise their ideal, we must now express our own claims in a more concrete form and find justification for the inevitable application of means of any kind which could serve in any way in the realisation of our objective, *national freedom.* In our previous article we had restricted ourselves to factual reporting of events in foreign countries and showing the possible consequences of this; now we shall be concerned with the analysis of the essence of the colonial situation, in order to be able to get an insight into the antithesis between ruler and ruled, on which the justification of our national freedom movement will be based. One fact that can be ascertained straight away is that the colonial situation in its purest form, in the first place consists mainly in the fact *that one country is the province of the other and that its natural wealth and furthermore the powers and talents of its population are claimed by the rulers and used for their own interests.*[14]

A few examples from history to illustrate this definition would not be superfluous! And where we see the development in the colonial situation of two opposing forces, namely the urge to keep the power on the part of the ruler on the one hand and the endeavour of the ruled to free himself from the burden of the foreign yoke on the other, we will examine the two said forces categorically.

We will start with the beginning of the colonial situation. history has clearly shown that greed and the pursuit of gain were the dominating causes of the Dutch colonisation in Indonesia. Initially the East Indies Company had come to Indonesian waters with the best of intentions for peaceful trading, but soon afterwards it conducted a blatant commercial policy. To satisfy their unlimited greed all rights and interests of the population, even the demands of humanity and morals, had to yield. In order that nobody but they themselves should profit from the proceeds of Indonesian wealth, fertile areas with all that grew in them had to be destroyed. 'Everywhere else they are systematically destroyed, the inhabitants trained to bring about the destruction with their own hands, the Kings of Ternate humiliated to the level of supervisors of this work of destruction'.[15] This deed, horrific enough by itself, was surpassed by the second deed, namely that the population of those destroyed areas were put to the sword or exiled to isolated areas where starvation eventually delivered them from their dreadful fate. Finally this unbridled greed, which gradually appeared in different forms and penetrated into all ranks from high to low, led

to the path of moral corruption, which caused the demise of this 'noble' company.

And when the Dutch government became the heir of the East Indies Company, it maintained, out of loyalty to tradition, the old coercive system called by the name of 'culture system', only for the sake of the Dutch treasury. It not only used the labouring power of the native population but also exploited it to such an extent that the latter almost perished physically. Those who showed themselves most adept at exploitation were rewarded with money and rank. The individual did not have the free disposal of his own labour and the product of his labours, so this could *really* be called a situation of slavery.[16] And if the Javanese part of the Indonesian people did not perish under that iron system, this is mainly due to the fact that it once belonged to one of the most powerful people on earth, whose economic and political influences had extended as far as the coasts of the China Sea and Madagascar and the coasts of East Africa.[17] But in the end every people, however strong they are, must greatly decline physically and psychologically under such circumstances for nearly a generation. The unspeakable misery of the people had been *one* motive for changing such a criminal system, but not *the* main motive. For the 'culture system' would surely have continued if the Dutch treasury had not been overflowing for a long time with the abundant yearly flood of profits from Indonesia.

But for the enfeebled Indonesian people the change-over from the culture policy meant nothing more than a change of exploiter. The danger was not imaginary, if one considers that the appearance of private initiative took place at the very moment that the population itself, after the tyranny of more than half a century, was physically completely defenceless and economically exhausted. Dr. Boeke characterises this: 'It broke the old bonds without replacing them by new organisations, shattered without joining afresh, exposed weakness without pouring in new strength and thus had a demoralising effect.[18] Thus it is not difficult to understand why the spoils of the private exploiter flooded in more abundantly than those during the two previous exploitation periods put together. The profiteering is merely less obvious!

This short descriptive discussion, the details of which have been borrowed from historical data, serve as an illustration of the Dutch colonial idea. Throughout all those periods nobody wondered about the immoral effect of the system applied: the only thing that

matters is how the 'sources of wealth' can be tracked down in the most profitable way. Thus we can now define with Douwes Dekker *colonisation* as '*the satisfaction of the rapacity and greed of the physically stronger nations, tempered slightly for the sake of economic or commercial interests at the expense of the weaker nations*'.

We are of the opinion that this definition is completely in accordance with reality.[19]

Now that we understand from the above the interest of Holland in its colonial property, we will try to discover the line of conduct that controls its actions in its endeavour to keep Indonesia forever as an object of exploitation. From this endeavour follows first and foremost the fact that no room must be left for the thought of nurturing ideals in the subjugated people. Since colonisation in the first and more important place must be subjugated to the interests of the ruler, we see that the suppressed people must be kept weak both physically and mentally. The privileges of power and authority are exclusively the rights of the ruler. Every feeling of freedom and independence is checked by tyrannical measures because it is too dangerous for the ruler's peace. Every resistance against this unbearable despotism is called in the language of the ruler 'riots' and therefore must be thoroughly and forcibly suppressed. But when the resistance is so serious that the power of the 'legal' authority is threatened, then they try with cunning and deceit, for instance by offering a truce and peace negotiations, to imprison the leader of the 'rebels', even though this action runs counter to military honour. A concrete example from history we find in the imprisonment of the Indonesian hero Dipo Negora, whom they could not subjugate by force.

Apart from depriving the population of all power any growth in spiritual power also had to be avoided. And that is the reason why education was not provided, for that would broaden the outlook of the subject and would enable him to assimilate ideas which would be dangerous for the ruler's peace. A historical example to illustrate this! In 1835 the resident of Banjoemas asked for 30 guilders (all of thirty guilders) for native education. When he had waited for an answer for ten months, he finally received the decision: 'Informing the said resident that his request for reasons of general suitability, cannot be granted'.[20] And until 1858 *not a cent* of the Indonesian budget was allotted to native education, in spite of the fact, that Indonesia yearly contributed millions of guilders in profit to the Dutch treasury. Later, when the exploitation of natural

sources demanded skilled and cheap labour, *utility*-education was provided.

Whereas in the beginning every awakening awareness was systematically repressed by *force*, as the Indonesians gained more insight and as they began to realise that human rights cannot possibly be the exclusive possession of a small group of people, the ruler needed different means to maintain his position than just the army: and this means the *law* in which his position is defined. Apparently this is a step forward to an organised state. But in an organised state[21] the law should first be approved by the people, or rather by its representatives, if it is to be related to the society which it embodies. Law imposed on one side by the other does not exist there. In Indonesian society the law is nothing but 'the violence of the authorities', as Stirner calls it. The only law that exists is one-sidedly imposed on the people by the ruler, composed according to his own views without troubling about the desires of the population, which has to live with that legal system. Is this justice? We, the Indonesian, regard it as nothing but an institution to secure the ruler's power. Of course there is no place in this law, as long as the foreign ruler is still despot, for the establishment of the claim of the population to the country's government and to the settlement of Indonesian demands. Not to mention taking part in the government; it was even explicitly stipulated in article 111 R.R. (*Indisch Staatsblad* 1885, no. 2) that all assemblies and associations of a political nature were forbidden. This stipulation was maintained until 1915, except in 1903 when on account of the introduction of the decentralisation law, some exceptions were made for assemblies and associations in order to able to *recommend* people for membership of local councils. 'Underlying this prohibition of political association and assembly there was the thought that interference by the population was unsuitable, since only the government was capable of judging what should be done in the interest of the people'.[22] Censorship of the press is also an important means to hide every 'outrage' from the supervision of public opinion. Thus the ruler has provided his own security. It is obvious, what kind of a judiciary one found and finds in Indonesia. Experience has taught us that it all amounts to racial discrimination in court. In name the courts are independent but the government will see to it that its will is done. For just like the exorbitant rights of the Governor-General which could not be justified from a legal point of view, this government has at its disposal a powerful weapon which it can use

at all times, if the judge, within the terms of a law, cannot deprive a man of his freedom who is dangerous in the eyes of the government.

We have enough convincing examples of how the ruler, when it concerns the maintenance of the property which he has acquired by unlawful means from the lawful owner, resorts to means which amount to the perpetuation of injustice. And all this happens in the name of legality. The ruler simply breaks all notions of justice and morals which he expects to be respected in his own country.

And they had free scope, as long as the Indonesians were powerless and there was no fear of foreign intervention! But as soon as the misery of the Indonesian population drew the attention of other countries and the Indonesians themselves, who had had enough of their suppression, prepared themselves for resistance, they needed another weapon than force and fake legality alone; they chose *mass suggestion*:[23] 'the injection of the idea of superiority of the white races to the Indonesian awareness and the suggestion of national impotence', which was propagated most keenly during the period of the so-called ethical policy. They pass themselves off as the elder brother whose task it was to bring up to the young 'brown brother' (sic.), who cannot look after himself yet. It is true also that as conscience, as misery and pauperism ate deeper and deeper into the Indonesian economic situation, began to have its say, this induced the ruler to the use of somewhat more humane principles, which were formulated in the words: 'care for the colony first and then for the mother country'. But in practice nothing ever comes of such self-deceptive slogans. The greed and self-interest remain the dominating factors and that is why it is absurd to believe that the ruler will voluntarily abandon his object of exploitation for the benefit of the ruled.

Meanwhile the Indonesians in their new awareness watched the white rulers in their attitudes and actions, which show a continuous performance of intrigues, deception and extortion, and were getting ready for an organised resistance. And the ship of ethics[24] ran aground, when in 1912 the concept of freedom first appeared on the Indonesian horizon. Since then the Indonesian demands for a free country started to be felt with more force and no authority can induce the nation to give up this claim.

In the above we have seen from historical examples, that greed and pursuit of gain are the primary motives of the Dutch colonisation in Indonesia. When analysing the line of action, which the

white ruler follows for the satisfaction of his primary motives, we have come to the conclusion, that continuance of the Dutch authority in Indonesia is the ideal of the coloniser. And his means to it are *violence* and *deceit.*

Now we must examine the ideal of a dominated people and the justification of our national freedom movement. Because of limited room we are forced to postpone the discussion of that to next time.

3

> '*... that love of country is the most beautiful sentiment which can ennoble a soul; and that a nation without independence is a nation without existence!*'
>
> Mustapha Kemal *in 1896*

The events of 1908 and 1912 were milestones in the history of Indonesia. The sweet eternal urge for freedom in man began to reveal itself again in the hearts of twentieth-century Indonesians. A soft glimmer broke through the dark night of serfdom. Then, finally, after decades of servitude and resignation there was the beginning of movement in the political life of Indonesian society. The ideal of a free country took shape and showed its colours. The concept of national freedom settled in the head and heart of every young Indonesian. No power could nip this bud; it was there, never to die again. It was destined to grow and it will grow into a national tree of liberty.

It was especially the best and most noble of the Indonesian people who first and most enthusiastically propagated this concept of national freedom. And no wonder! For in every struggle for national freedom it is the intellectual part of the people that forms the core. It is the educated sons of the country and particularly those from the middle class, who prepare the rebirth of the nation and usually not without great sacrifices. They feel and understand the pain and the misery of their people. They are the people who are fully aware of the enslavement by the foreign ruler; they feel most deeply the humiliation of being unfree. And that is the reason why educated sons of the country rush into battle first to assert the national claim to freedom, although they know that they may perish in that battle. Even when there were still very few of them, when there was not a glimmer of hope in the masses, they headed for their death, in the fullest conviction that only that deed could stir the masses into carrying on their cause.

Initially the masses resigned themselves to their fate. For decades they passively endured the tortures of a doomed system. It was not that they did not realise they were suffering, it was not that they did not feel the tortures, but they did not have the ability to express themselves. And since they were completely unorganised, the government succeeded without trouble in instilling servility in them. And it was especially the foreign civil servants of the lower ranks who did this with their tyrannical measures. They only promoted ignorance and the deep social misery of the masses. They only forced them to fulfil their duties towards the state as good citizens.

To teach them the rights that they had as subjects of this country, was a thing that the civil servants obviously did not do. For as soon as the masses knew their rights, the ruler would lose his position of strength. The heavier the taxes weighed on the ignorant masses, the better for the rulers, for the greater was their reward. Not care for the welfare of the population, but self-interested motives determined their deeds.

And to whom could the masses complain, if injustice was done, for they knew nobody but their oppressors? Intuitively they felt that as citizens of a state they had rights as well as duties; but in what way could they assert their claims to these rights? They were powerless. The fact that they could not read or write only aggravated their servility. And the farmers, who made up the majority of the population, could only think of their piece of ground that they tilled. As a consequence of the heavy taxes they had to pay, their spiritual horizon ended at their rice-fields and meadows. And around it a brick wall. And in this way the people, in a haze of blank indifference, were kept down for centuries. Of the promotion of this situation every ruler or despot rendered himself guilty. For in it lay his power and his advantage. Thus a pure motive of egotism!

Who else but our educated countrymen would stand up against this? They felt it their task to lead the people from darkness to light. The suffering that their people endure is their suffering. The humiliation that their people must undergo, wounds their very hearts. Great is the task for the intellectual sons of the country which is ruled by a foreign race. Their first objective is to make their people realise that their humiliation is an unbearable evil, to awake the urge for freedom, in other words to make them appreciate the highest goods in life. Beautiful is the vocation, but heavy is the

task. Especially when one knows that the route one is going to take will lead along impassable roads. Those who first started on this expedition were heroes. Inspired by idealism and gifted with initiative and courage they united to enter the lists against the foreign rulers. What did they care, if they perished in the battle against the enemy, if their deed would lead their people a step further in the direction of ultimate freedom? What did they care, so long as their beloved country would be allotted that happiness? The will to be free, coupled with the will to fight, possibly followed by one's death, that will can only be aroused in the people by the example of an undaunted individual. They feel that no sacrifice is too great for their country. To the ideal of freedom they sacrifice everything. And for serving this ideal many of them endure the bitterness of exile for the rest of their lives. But the names of those martyrs will not easily be forgotten by their descendants.

In more than one respect it was the students, inflamed by patriotic idealism who gave the impulse to the struggle for freedom. And so we find after many centuries, that the ideal of freedom is roused and the struggle for freedom initiated by the best and most noble of the people.

And this is how we see the deeds of the pioneers of our national movement. And two dates will live forever, 1908 the foundation of Boedi Oetomo, the pioneer of our national struggle and 1912, the foundation of the Indonesian Party which sharply formulated the ideal of a free party. It required a certain courage and intrepidity from our pioneers in those days to dare launch a thought of such far-reaching significance. Because they still lived in a period of strict censorship and without freedom of speech. And yet in less than no time they succeeded in advocating the concept of freedom, the idea of an independent country all around the equator. The notions of a few had become the idea of an entire nation. And thus they achieved, to use Hegel's words, a 'Fortschritt im Bewusztsein der Freiheit'. The words of those few people, were, as it were, a prophecy in the ears of the masses, a shining message of the national re-birth. While this deed as such already required courage and intrepidity, on the other hand it also bore witness to the fact, that in the Indonesian masses the concept of the highest good in life, freedom, had already intuitively and instinctively lived. Following the examples of the intrepid and devoted individuals which they regarded as their leaders, they were prepared to join in the battle.

In this awareness of the people of their misery and repression lies the explanation of why the national movements such as the National Indonesian Party and the Sarikat Islam immediately had such enormous success. Difficult was the task of the first individuals who paved the way for freedom through the dark woods and slippery paths, especially since the masses were so docile and since their confidence in their leaders knew no bounds. But those individuals had already found a point of support in the formulation of the ideals themselves, when they started their struggle against domination.

How and when were the first dawnings of the concept of freedom in the brains of the Indonesian intellectuals? When the masses in the first years of the twentieth century were still unmoved, when the Indonesian people were still sleeping their lethargic sleep, the example of Japan was continually in their minds. On the other hand the study of world history brought them into contact with the history of freedom movements. The guerilla warfare here and elsewhere furnished food for thought. The resulting facts they brought to bear on the future of their own, as yet unfree, country. The heroic deeds in particular had their attention. The names of those heroes were constantly in their mouth. Thus names such as Wilhelm Tell, Mazzini, Garibaldi etc. etc., sounded as the finest and most attractive new music in their ears. They wanted to follow their examples. They learned to appreciate the French revolution also as a cultural historical turning point in the history of humanity. And in the schools of the rulers himself they were told about the Dutch freedom fighters and learned to appreciate them. They were also taught that the Netherlands are indebted to those courageous heroes for the independence of their country, then and now. They could not help thinking of their own heroes who only wanted to do what the heroes of the ruler himself had done: liberate their country from the foreign yoke and keep it free from foreign blemishes. And yet these national heroes were called in the language of the ruler 'rebels'; they were subjected to all sorts of abuse. And all this the sensitive Indonesians had to hear and endure. And thus a more concrete image of freedom developed in their minds. Thus the period of passive endurance did not seem entirely in vain; it was also a period of reflection, a reflection which changed into an ideal, which included the picture of the country as it would be in the future. And since they had now shaped their ideal of freedom the realisation of the latter was required. Action was needed! That

started off the national movement, which would not be halted again.

During his reflections the subject had not failed to watch the barbaric methods of the ruler and to examine the factors which underlay his power. He began to analyse them and found that the authority of the ruler was founded on power, in all its shapes and sly applications, supported by the law. He also found that as long as the law can be drawn up and used at will by the ruler, the subject was and remained powerless. That was why their first ambition was to influence the law in the direction of national demands. But before it could come to that, they first had to achieve the power factor of political freedom, i.e. freedom of political speech. In this way they wanted to achieve a national parliament, where the laws of the country would be made. They realised, that by begging alone they would not achieve that result, for from history they learned, if one wants to gain something, it must be extorted. The all-powerful ruler did not like voluntary gifts. For in his power lay his possibility for exploitation. To the absolute serfdom of another he was indebted for his unlimited freedom of the exercise of power. All this the Indonesians realised only too clearly. And in this atmosphere the idea arose of a mass organisation which alone could arouse public opinion. In the mass organisation they saw a powerful instrument against the ruler. And thus we also witnessed the birth of the idea of *national unity*, the unity of an entire Indonesia independent of local differences. We were not to be distracted anymore by the sweet whistling of the hypocritical bird-catcher, who said that the unity of Indonesia was a contradiction because it consisted of a conglomeration of people, belonging to different human races, with different religions, manners and customs, with no connection between them and that this unity they talked of was only possible under Dutch sovereignty. Poor fellows who made this claim, they know neither world history nor the history of Indonesia.[25] In the circumstances the actions of the Indonesians were only determined by what they wanted. And the will is the builder of all things, says a distinguished philosopher. They unearthed the work of a French writer and historian Renan and found in it what they wanted confirmed in words: 'Une nation est une âme, un principe spirituel'. From that they drew the conclusion that a nation is only determined by the will of the people to belong together. The history of the formation of states everywhere else had already confirmed this thesis. And if that had not been the case, how else would Lothrop Stoddard have dared build his conclusion that

'nationalism is a belief, held by a fairly large number of individuals, that they constitute a "nationality"; it is a sense of belonging together as a nation?' And thus they found firm ground for their conviction that the ideal of the Indonesian country would be realised in the future. From that day of expectation alone there was a stimulant; doubly inspired to work for that objective. In every adversity they felt encouraged by the realisation of the coming glory; on the horizon they always saw the vague outlines of the Promised Fatherland. The Fatherland had become everybody's favourite word; the free Fatherland the sacred image. They did not forget, however, that the recapture of this Fatherland would necessarily involve blood and tears. That they had learned from the history of liberation of every suppressed people. And that is why the revolution as the ultimate means was idealised. But for the sake of the nation they felt obliged to avoid bloodshed as much as possible. If it were not possible to escape this iron fate, which not a single dominated people had escaped so far, then they wanted to save it to the last minute, until they arrived at the gate of the promised Fatherland. There they would fight the decisive battle, for there would be no alternative, if the enemy kept refusing them admittance to the only gate. But before it had come to that point, all means had to be used which would not lead to bloodshed. They hoped they could avoid it. They had hoped that the ruler would relax his rigid principles for the sake of a harmonious solution to the threatening problem. And expecting that, they initially chose the safe parliamentary route. They knew however that they could not completely give up this system of extortion. They had learned that from history. All national power, incorporated in the national movements, was put into operation to extort from the government the promise to give the awakening nation the parliament they were entitled to. They used public meetings and the press as means of coercion. Instinctively they felt that this policy would do no good and that disappointment after disappointment would await them. In spite of this they still saw reasons for confidence in the government. And they thought that they had progressed when they had extorted the promise for a General Council. But their exaltation had been premature. After a short time they realised that a political game was being played with them. The government was doing this to pacify the seething discontent of the population.

But they only achieved the opposite. The fury of the people rose to a climax and reached its culminating point, when in Europe the

November Resolution brought down or threatened to bring down many a throne. Above our country too the storm looked like breaking. It was a trick of the ruler that saved him from this disaster. He was obliged to give in to the demands of the Indonesians, if he did not want to be chased into the sea. At heart he did not symphathise with the idea at all, but he was seized with fear. On behalf of Governor-General Count Van Limburg Stirum, the latter's highest representative in the 'colonies' made his historical *November promise*, which held out the prospect of amendment of the untenable state of constitutional affairs. The composition of the committee of amendment which was in charge of the preparation of a new system of government justified the belief of the ruled in the good faith of the ruler.

But again their hopes were deceived. For hardly had the storm subsided when the ruler forgot what he had so solemnly promised. 'Modern Politics' says *Hindia Poetra*, no. 5, 1923, 'is too set in its traditional ways for it to attach importance for one single moment to what its pen and tongue had dished up to the world as a truth'. Because of these political tricks the people lost their confidence in the ruler. And that it had to come to this point, the government has only itself to blame. During the years that the leaders of the people's movement wasted their efforts in the so-called General Council, they realised that cooperation with the government could not exist and that a clash before long would be inevitable. Cooperation with the ruler means giving up one's own ideals. And giving up the ideal of freedom is impossible. Its immortality is assured. In millions of heads that ideal is firmly rooted, and yet the government will take no account of it.

The antithesis between ruler and ruled is so sharp, the abyss between both is so wide, that mutual understanding without losing sight of the interests of the ruled is not possible. The ruled will even be pleased to guarantee all material interest of the ruler if the latter will give him back his freedom. But the latter is not prepared to give up his 'possession'. It is the ruler's short-sighted shopkeeper's mentality, which unnecessarily aggravates the conflict, and increases bitterness at his own expense. As the 'noble' servant *of the greed and pursuit of gain* and as a worshipper of material possessions he cannot listen to the sincere desires of an appressed people to be allowed to live alongside other peoples. All kinds of excuses he uses to deny to the ruled the right to that desire. He does not care if his motives clash with the facts, justice and morals. He

is only concerned with finding a justification for his point of view. And what kind of excuses he puts forward is of secondary importance. Of primary importance is the maintenance of his own unimpaired authority. He can always use violence to make people respect his unjust point of view. The fatal result of this shop-keeper's policy is, that the ruled places his demands against the rigid demands of the ruler. And when that moment has come, then the violent clash is at hand. Revolutionary action is dawning on the horizon.

And we are now at that stage!

What route we will have to take in the future, is not difficult to see. The system of trusting the government has had its day, just like the system of pleading. In the struggle that has now started for the achievement of our national freedom, we can only rely on our own powers, on our own willingness to make sacrifices. And the time will come that fate will decide who of this generation will have to sacrifice himself first on the altar of freedom. And not a single true Indonesian will want to escape this.

But above all our tactics are determined by the circumstances we are in. Fighting with visor raised, however much we would have liked to, is no longer possible. It is the ruler himself, who forces us to continue the unequal fight with other weapons. Whenever there is open resistance against that unbearable authority the government retaliates with tyrannical measures. Even in the most secret meeting-places the spies of the ruler who lie in wait for their victims like vultures, manage to penetrate. And naturally under those circumstances, the national struggle moves to underground action, where the fighters can feel safe. This method of fighting is not new, for history has given us numerous examples. And from these examples we have learned, that this political strategy can procure one the ultimate victory.

Nobody will doubt that we in our struggle to achieve our national freedom cannot rely on support from public opinion in the countries of the white section of the world. In the first place the ruler himself has sealed off the entrance to this public opinion. But even if it had been possible to call the attention of public opinion in Europe and elsewhere to our national claims, what use would that be? Is the colonial conflict not identical to a *racial conflict*? From the sharp conflict of the white and coloured races, which has been a regular occurrence in the past few years, we can only conclude one thing. Anyone who is not deaf and blind must have observed

the same. We have seen how Ireland was morally supported in its fight for independence by the public opinion of the white races. But who apart from some writers wanted to take a stand for India, Egypt etc? On the contrary, public opinion explicitly ranged itself on the side of England. The existence of racial conflict cannot be denied anymore. The problem of finding a solution for it will dominate world politics in the future. And that is why the fine slogans about brotherhood of man and the synthesis of East and West for the time being will remain Utopian, as much as the many fantastic stories that mention a paradise on earth. As long as the cause of evil has not been removed, people will always fight the results of it in vain.

We nationalists must see the world as it is, for only in that way can our attitude be pure. The examples sketched above must convince us that the salvation of our Fatherland is up to us ourselves. We can no longer expect help from the ruler, who will not voluntarily give up the property that ensures the satisfaction of his material hunger, neither can we rely on the League of Nations, that has apparently become a League specifically for those European nations that feel threatened. In this National struggle for freedom we can only rely on our own efforts. Therefore our slogan will be: *self-confidence and willingness to make sacrifices.* And with this device we will head for victory forward!

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, 1924-1925

1. Walther Rathenau, *Op nieuwe banen* (*die neue Wirtschaft*), p. 4.
2. R. Kjellèn, *De politieke vraagstukken van de wereldoorlog*, p. 55.
3. Then Italy will be able to settle its own affairs.
4. Five-year edition of the Indonesian Society, p. 37.
5. René Grousset, *Le Réveil de l'Asie*, p. 36.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
8. *Le Temps*, 26th August, 1924: 'Egypte. La question du Soudan'.
9. *Journal des Débats*, 2nd September, 1924.
10. One should keep in mind that this article was written before the meeting between Zagloel Pasja and Ramsay MacDonald.
11. *Journal des Débats*, 1st Sept., 1924: 'La Grande Bretagne et l'Irak'.
12. *Le Temps*, 2nd September, 1924: 'L'Agitation Swarajiste'.
13. Jacques Bainville, *L'Histoire de France*, p. 342.
14. We mention here only the main characteristics because a complete definition of the colonial situation cannot possibly be expressed in one sentence.
15. Van Soest, *Cultuurstelsel I*, p. 30.
    Valentein (*Oud en Nieuw Indiën*, part II, p. 259) has calculated the result of this unparalleled action that is also known under the more comprehensive name of 'Hongi excursions'. Readers who are interested are referred to it.

16. According to a rough estimation, says Van Kol (*De Vrijmaking van Ned.-Indië*, p. 11), from October 1849 to March 1850, more than 100.000 men, women and children died of starvation in the surroundings of Semarang alone. They had not been able to cultivate their own rice-fields!
800.000 families were subjugated for the cultivation of the crops, altogether a group of 4,000,000 people so that in fact half of Java had become a slave colony.
17. *Cf. Ons Gedenkboek*, the articles: 'Opgang', p. 21; 'Indonesia in de Wereldgemeenschap', p. 41-43; 'De Gang des Tijds', p. 94.
18. Dr. J. H. Boeke, *Auto-activiteit naast autonomie*, p. 54 (lecture given to the Indische Genootschap).
19. Deceptive phrases about the concept of colonisation are preached by many scholars, especially by those whose countries are committed to colonial possessions, as though colonisation constitutes a duty of civilisation. As Taillot (*L'avenir colonial de la France*) says: *It is an action exercised by civilised people on a Country with a civilisation inferior to their own, with the object of progressively transforming it by exploiting its natural resources and by the improvement of material and moral conditions.*
This definition sounds nice but clashes with reality, for nowhere was colonisation started for the sake of philanthropy to educate less civilised people. The purpose has always been and will always be the exploitation of the natural resources of the dominated country. As we have seen above, this often involves the exploitation of the natives too. And yet all this happens 'in the name of civilisation'.
20. Stokvis, *Van Wingewest tot zelfbestuur*, p. 81.
21. For in an organised state we see how in the divisions of power, as Montesquieu distinguished them into three groups, the main power, the *legislature*, is in the hands of the people or rather in the hands of the representatives of the people, the *Executive* in the hands of the ministers (sometimes also including the head of state) and the *judiciary* in the hands of the independent courts, while the police force sees to it that the legal findings are observed. Even now this condition is not yet fulfilled in Indonesia. The ruler only seems to take steps in that direction when circumstances force him to. But in *reality* government despotism, albeit covertly, continues to exist.
22. Kleintjes, *Staatsinstellingen van Ned.-Indië*, part I, 4th ed., p. 135.
23. Mass suggestion was elaborately dealt with in *Hindia Poetra*, no. 5 (first volume) in the article 'Het psychologisch Conflict', to which those interested are referred.
24. In a lecture to the Indische Genootschap on the results and prospects of the ethical line of action in our colonial policy Mr. J. E. Stokvis dealt in an excellent manner with the failure of the ethical policy. An accurate reader will also discover in it the typical picture of the nature of the ethics at that time. The greater part of them called themselves ethic, as long as the Indonesian remained meek and showed himself to be inferior to his 'white brother' and as long as he still had faith in the 'good' intentions of the ruler. But as soon as the Indonesian puts forward his *wishes*, then ethics cease to exist. Men felt threatened and became reactionary. Then the cloven hoof came out.
25. It would be instructive for them to acquaint themselves with the following passage from the article from *De Gids* titled 'Aanslag op Leiden' of the Leiden professors C. Van Vollenhoven, A. W. Nieuwenhuis, C. Snouk Hurgronje, Ph. S. Van Ronkel, H. T. Colenbrander, G. A. J. Hazeu and N. J. Krom: 'Without wanting to prophesy about the national development which awaits us in the Dutch Indies, we deny, from objective grounds, that the native population of Indonesia belongs "to different human races" which

"have no other connection than that (their areas) all are under Dutch rule" (Treub, *Indië's Toekomst*, 1924, p. 12), and state as a fact, that the majority of this population belong to one single, the Indonesian race, which in the past and present has numerous bonds, which are increasing in number and significance.'

13 The growth of the P.N.I. and government terrorism in Indonesia

Hardly three years ago, on the 4th of July 1927, when our national movement was still in the middle of the most tragic days of a period, in which the vengeance and lust for power of the Dutch colonial imperialism was at its zenith, the *Partai Nasional Indonesia* was founded. We owe it to the undaunted courage of some nine men, led by Ir. Soekarno, that on the ruins of the old *P.K.I.*- and *S.R.*-organization a new mass movement has come into existence of which we can be proud. It was only courage and an unshakeable belief in the just cause that could induce somebody at that time to try his hand at rebuilding the national movement.

For in those times unspeakable dangers were involved in such a step. People lived in a time in which the government was suffering severely from a fear psychosis, as a result of the well known November and January revolts. Many leaders of those revolts died on the gallows, hundreds of rebels were thrown into the overcrowded prisons, while yet hundreds of other supporters of the freedom movement were chased into the jungle of the Upper-Digoel.

It was also in those days, that the government announced, that every attempt to form a new communist party, in whatever form, would be punished without mercy. And who could prevent the mighty colonial authorities from regarding every new organisation as a transformed P.K.I.? Above all things they were intent on showing the people that Dutch authority was still firmly established in Indonesia. Every measure taken against each rebel had to be so appalling that the population, already held in check by force of arms, would be intimidated even more. It is the psychology of power that forms one of the pillars on which the inwardly weak colonial authority is based.

Under this explosive atmosphere only very few could believe in the possibility of rebuilding the mass organisation, on a completely new basis. Even into some Indonesia-Nationalist circles the fatal

idea had penetrated that with the defeat of the November-movement the dream of an 'Indonesia Merdeka' had drowned in the Indian Ocean. And it was only the unshakeable confidence in the strength of mind and the endurance of the Indonesian people that could provide a bright spot in those dark tragic times. And the nine pioneers of the P.N.I.: Ir. Soekarno, Mr. Sartono, Dr. Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo, Soedjadi, Mr. Iskaq, Ir. Anwari, Dr. Samsi, Mr. Soejoedi and Mr. Soenarjo, had that confidence. When they took the plunge, however, they had no idea that their party would so soon be the popular people's organization of Indonesia.

What psychological factors were there to be considered then? The organisable body of people had for the greatest part been under the leadership of the P.K.I., which had undoubtedly put its stamp on the National Movement between the years 1923 and 1926. Could they now be won over to the P.N.I., if this organisation came out with purely nationalistic or – if you like patriotic slogans? Different from the previous P.K.I. its ultimate object is simply national freedom, which they want to attain by their own efforts and abilities, independent of the help of strangers. The question of the shape of society is for them a matter of future concern. As long as the foreign ruler is still there, all efforts and energy need to be concentrated on the one goal; the national liberation. But above all things the P.N.I. wants to be a party of the people, for without the masses every colonial struggle for liberation is illusory. This basic principle contains something of the creed, which puts its stamp on the whole of the campaign of the P.N.I., but which obviously has not been recognized yet by many people.

For the P.N.I. the people mean everything. With the people one gains respect or is brought to one's ruin. The fate of the masses is decisive for that of the individual who determines it. An individual can only be called free when he belongs to a free nation. And a free nation cannot endure tyranny, either from a foreign ruler, or from a hierarchic clique, or from a privileged class, though they may be called the intelligentsia. The masses are the essential part of the people and within it beats the heart of the nation. The intellect merely has the task of detecting the spontaneous fresh strength of the people and express it. The principle of the *sovereignty of the people* in the purest sense of the word underlies this conception; when the destiny of a nation is at stake then the will of the masses should be the deciding factor.

This principle is not new: the Perhimpoenan Indonesia already knew it. P.N.I. translates it into action, proclaims it to the masses in order to accustom them to their principal right.

Now as it happened, the word 'nationalism' had acquired a pejorative meaning in the ears of the masses who at the time had fought under communist colours. And not without reason, for nationalism was too often identified with the interests of a small group of intellectuals and privileged people, under whose command they fought. And with sore distress the Indonesian masses had to experience how this group purposely held aloof. And is it likely then that those masses, with this experience, will put their faith in the newly found P.N.I. whose founders for the greatest part consisted of academic intellectuals? This was an important psychological factor, which in those days had great weight with the pioneers of P.N.I. in their calculation of prospective possibilities.

But the facts have clearly shown, that the Indonesian masses are endowed with ample political discrimination. They soon discovered that the nationalism of P.N.I. was something vastly different from what they had been used to in Indonesia so far. Whereas the latter had been based on the needs of the Indonesian intelligentsia, the former is based on the rights and needs of the masses.

And the miracle happened! In great numbers the masses ranged themselves under the banners of P.N.I. It is clear it was not some dogma that was decisive in gaining the sympathy of the Indonesian masses. Only a national campaign aiming at improving their lot can induce them into giving their support. It is curious to note here that P.N.I. soon gained the confidence of the masses because they were led, as Ir Soekarno once said: 'By the intellectual flower of the Indonesian people'. Although P.N.I. as a young party fights beside an old and experienced party, the P.S.I.I., it has surpassed the latter in size in no time. Its fame is so widely spread over all of Indonesia, both in the towns and country, that the *Indische Courant* calls the present period of the Indonesian national movement 'de *moesim* P.N.I.'.

The great attraction which P.N.I. has for young and old is due to the concept of independence, of a united Indonesia, non-co-operation and self-sufficiency which are clearly formulated and propagated with force. For an effective improvement of the life of the masses the Indonesian people will need self-determination, this is the basic principle of P.N.I. policy. They explain to the masses that political power is the most important factor in gaining economical power and bringing about the improvement of the national

standard of living. A united Indonesia is the goal that is aimed for, because only a unanimous Indonesia can break the power of tyranny. Based on this concept P.N.I. has given the impulse to the formation of a national political bloc, embodied in the P.P.P.K.I. But that is not all that is needed for the forming of a national power. The centre of gravity for the struggle for Indonesian unity should lie in the masses themselves. The liberation of Indonesia requires the birth of a rational self-reliant mass action. For an unarmed and defenceless people such as the Indonesian can only claim respect for their demands, when all of the masses make a stand for their rights. Therefore P.N.I. considers it one of their first duties to instill in the feelings, thoughts and action of the people the interest for the freedom movement. Not only the active fighters for the cause, but also the silent supporters in town and country must evoke themselves completely to the fight. Everybody must realise what the national claims are. Here the wheels of the four propaganda points gear into each other. In order that the totality of the masses becomes interested in the national case, it is necessary that they have confidence in themselves and are convinced that they are capable of anything as long as the will to do it exists. The pressure of many years that has been put on the Indonesian people to convince them of their national impotence and inferiority must be swept away. And that is where non-cooperation and self-sufficiency come in. The idea that they themselves must ensure the national existence independently gives the people back their self-confidence and stimulates their urge for action. Nothing is more detrimental to the arousing of latent powers of the masses and the increase in their sense of justice and political awareness than the deliberate disguise of the real contrast in interest between the ruler and the ruled.

This, P.N.I. sees as her task, in complete agreement with the ideology of Perhimpoenan Indonesia and they lead their campaign accordingly! It is those four principles that have given P.N.I. such great popularity with the masses. The words of the leaders were felt by the people as if taken straight from their hearts. The sober simplicity and the great willingness to make sacrifices which the leaders showed, not to mention their sympathic behaviour, contributed a lot to increasing the authority of P.N.I.

In the social field too, P.N.I. has done a lot in a very short time, especially in proportion to the resources available to them. Mass education is organized to fight illiteracy; universities for the people are opened in various places; national schools are founded; courses

are given to encourage the formation of a framework. Many cooperative societies come into existence under the leadership of or encouragement by the P.N.I. The active branch of Jakarta has linked to their society buildings, of which they have already three, consultation bureaux to advise the people in economical and legal cases. Moreover they possess their own general clinic, where since the foundation in July 1929 until the 1st of December of this year medical help was given to no less than 1,093 people suffering from various diseases. With all this it must not be forgotten that P.N.I. are only at the beginning of their social programme. The organization of trade and farmers' unions is already being prepared. With the growth of the cooperative societies, they were also starting to prepare for the foundation of cooperative banks. The execution of the concept of self-sufficiency will also be extended into the field of industry and other branches of the national economy. The rapid execution of these plans is hindered at the present moment by lack of resources. Where the colonial government and educational system means that the greater part of Indonesian intellectuals are only interested in their own material existence, P.N.I. is obliged to train their leaders themselves, within the framework of their own organization in the heat of the trouble. This is no disappointment to them. The history of all times has shown that only personalities that have been formed by a difficult fight are capable of achieving great things. When most intellectuals keep aloof from the mass movement P.N.I. consoles itself with the thought that intellectualism and academic freedom are no guarantee of political awareness. Certainly there are tens of Indonesian government servants who feel sympathy for P.N.I. in silence; but because of their daily bread, they dare not get involved with them. In this way P.N.I. does not escape the general rule that every beginning is difficult. But they had the willpower to overcome! During the struggle P.N.I. will produce leader personalities who will not only be able to control the masses but will also be equal to their heavy tasks. As soon as self-sufficiency develops further, the people will increasingly feel independent of the ruler and will clearly realise that the Blanda in Indonesia is not indispensable. What a source of power this could represent!

The leaders of P.N.I. have not kept the masses in ignorance of the goal for which they are aiming. The course P.N.I. wishes to follow is sharply outlined. And this explains their power and their success with the masses!

Just how much P.N.I. lives in the heart of the people, we have recently been able to see again from the account of the celebration of the two year's existence of their Jakarta branch on the 8th December 1929. 'From 6 o'clock in the morning the crowds were flooding in. Men and women coming all the way from Kebajoran, Paal-merah and Tanah Abang to hear the leaders speak. By 8 o'clock the police could not let any more people in, except press representatives and members of the organizing board with their guests from Bandung, who only arrived at 9 o'clock. When the meeting was opened at 9.15, there were at a rough estimation more than 1500 people gathered together.' Inspite of the rain the building was cramped full of people so that hundreds of them had to be sent back home. Because of this the organising committee decided to have another meeting around 7 o'clock on the same evening. In all the *Persatoean Indonesia* calculated that more than 3500 people had been gathered together that day and with reason Mr. Sartono could proudly say, that P.N.I. only two years after its foundation had shown not only that it had reason for its existence but also that it had become indispensable in the present national movement; it had become a *sjarat* for the movement for unity and independence.

What worries the colonialists is the undeniable fact that the power of the P.N.I. extends far beyond the limits of its members and that it is moving in an increasingly wider circle. If Indonesia did not suffer so much from arbitrariness of government and police authorities, if there was not a system of identity cards and if the people had full freedom of movement then P.N.I. would already have more than a million supporters. But at the moment the situation is thus, that the possibility of organization is limited to the towns. However, no government tyranny can prevent the steady growth of P.N.I. Already the *Java-Bode* mentioned with great anxiety that the number of members of P.N.I. in West Java over a period of only four months had increased by 6669 people, of which 844 at Batavia and 2863 at Bandung. The development of the party in Middle-Preanger has led to an increase of another 3000 members.

With all this one should not forget that P.N.I., especially during the first years, keeps strictly to the principle of self-limitation. The dark intrigues and complications of the very numerous unscrupulous spies of the government have induced the leaders of the P.N.I. to submit the entry of new members to very strict conditions. The candidate members are observed for six months and will

then only be allowed into the party when it can be proved that their inward inclination for the P.N.I. is sufficient. In this way they want to limit as far as possible the danger of agents provocateurs. But all the same the influence of the P.N.I. outside the party will not decrease.

Part of the tactics is to form good and sound cores right from the beginning, around which the horizontal massive extension of the party will take place. As soon as the fixed centres have been created, the agents provocateurs can do very little with their destructive activities.

One can see that P.N.I. by a systematic organisation has secured itself a firm basis on Indonesian ground and it has taken its place in the heart of every true Indonesian. From the day of its foundation reactionaries have kept a careful eye on it. With the increasing popularity of P.N.I. with the masses, there have been signs of an increasingly growing nervousness in the camp of the 'kaoem sana'. And measures of the government against the P.N.I. are nothing but the reflection of that worried feeling, of the nervous fear, to lose this rich colonial possession in the near future. And in that light we must see the recent razzias against P.N.I.

When P.N.I. was still young the government could express its feelings about it in fine words. It was said that the honourable Sir de Graeff would not be a true Dutchman if he did not respect the Indonesian nationalistic ideals. But hardly a year later the government deputy for General affairs had to exhort the leaders of P.N.I. to be careful in future not to continually press the narrow margin between what is inadmissible and what is just about admissible. And a little later they were warned, *that the Indonesian leaders are responsible not only for what they have said, but also for the possible consequences of their words.*

This was a menace of great significance! For in a colonially ruled country the authoritarian government does not require great statesmanship to see a causal link between two events, which in reality have nothing to do with each other. That was a Machiavellian manoeuvre of a government which turned to force for the preservation of its power. At that time P.N.I. had already conquered an important place in the political field. This society with its outspoken freedom slogans began to acquire a dangerous character in the eyes of the government. Not because they would move there where they would get into trouble with the law but because the leaders had

urged their supporters not to use any force in order to deprive the agents provocateurs of the chance for sabotage, while they also made a stand against the government and imperial colonialism regularly. Even Indonesian government and police officers often and openly showed their sympathy for the struggle of P.N.I. With their freedom propaganda P.N.I. leaders touch upon a sensitive string in the soul of every true and selfrespecting Indonesian. Only the servile soul, which will sell itself for money, will be insensitive to it.

The curious thing is that it is not forbidden in the colonial laws to strive after national independence. So legally there is no way to hinder the freedom propaganda of P.N.I. The growing realisation in the people of national freedom means the beginning of the end for Dutch colonial imperialism. This is the dilemma that the government is faced with!

Only brutal force can resolve this problem. This explains why the apparently ethical government is so easily led by sadistic outpourings of the reactionary press. Gradually it is slipping down to the place where it naturally belongs as a guardian of colonial capital; in the camp of notorious reactionaries.

The measures against P.N.I. started with arbitrary intervention of policemen during mass meetings. In some places words like 'freedom', 'exploitation', 'oppression', have been blacklisted. Every policeman has the authority to make people stop speaking or to break up the meeting. One can detect the same symptomatic phenomenon of oppression of a freedom of speech that is already very small, that had frequently occurred during the communist period of the national movement (1923-1926). Truly, an inexhaustible patience and great self-control are required from the Indonesian leaders to do their national duty under this oppressing atmosphere.

In the country they are at the mercy of the lust for power of the heads of the provincial governing body, who feel more powerful than their lord and master at Bogor. Without a decision from the Governor-General or without having to think about exorbitant rights, they can afford the luxury of interning in their place of residence the influential leaders of their province.

In spite of this, the soil here too is fertilised with the spirit of P.N.I.; it grows in spite of oppression. Even deep in the interior of Sumatra where the B.B. is so powerful, it can boast fervent supporters and a flourishing branch at Air Itam in spite of all terrorist measures. In those places where there is no branch of P.N.I., people take comfort from flying its flag, the red and white banner with the

head of a banteng, a glorious symbol of the coming freedom. In Lampong, Palembang, S.W.K., Medan, yes, even in Atjeh, they are constantly waiting with impatience for the arrival of their loved leader Soekarno to help found new branches. Only the existing system of passes makes his visit to these areas impossible.

Now that the ideals of P.N.I. have begun to penetrate into almost all corners of the archipelago, will it be surprising if the nervousness of the 'kaoem sana' exceeds the normal bounds? Another symptomatic sign we were shown, when the Governor of West-Java, Mr. Hartelust, announced severe measures against the membership of P.N.I. for civil servants. Soon his example was imitated by the army leaders, who announced in a circular that membership of P.N.I. was forbidden to all military and civil servants of the Department of War, as also to their wives and children, relatives living in, housekeepers and servants. Yes, even maids of civil servants who have nothing to do with the government are now tied to the colonial slave system. Indeed, a monumental testimony against a government that professes to be sure of its position.

In the meanwhile, unscrupulous agents provocateurs do their utmost to collect false news about P.N.I. And the rumour was spreading all over Java, that a new mass revolt was about to happen. On the other hand one cannot blame this scum of the earth because their stomach also wants its say. Their usefulness for the secret service is dependent on the amount of 'news' about the mass movements and their leaders which they manage to report. In this way they help to aggravate the already strained atmosphere; this is what they live for. This and similar symptomatic disturbances in the circles of the government were a warning that the government of the Honourable Mr. de Graeff began to be a danger to itself and to society. And indeed! Hardly two months later on the 29th December 1929, a sensational raid was organised against the P.N.I. And that meant the end of a regime of uncertainty that continually proves itself to be an anachronism, that professes on the one hand to want to claim the confidence of the Indonesian population and on the other hand rules while strongly under the influence of the notorious colonial reactionaries.

The attack on P.N.I. was very carefully prepared. Even the policemen on duty – some thousands of them – were only told at the last minute what was going to happen. Mobilisation of the police was organised in such a way that all of them would raid the circles of P.N.I.

at the same time in the whole of Indonesia. In more than 37 places, of which 27 on Java, 8 on Sumatra, 1 on Celebes and 1 on Borneo, this display of power by the police took place. Altogether about 480 houses were searched; 400 on Java, 50 on Sumatra, 28 on Celebes, and a few on Borneo. The nervousness of the authorities was obviously so deep that even the houses of their own loyal native civil servants were not spared. About 180 leaders of P.N.I. were arrested at the same time, but the greater part of them were seized shortly after.

It had all been staged very nicely; the police action had to come as a complete surprise. It was meant to impress the population!

With this raid the colonial authorities wanted to demonstrate that they were still firmly in command and they also wanted to show how ready to act the police, their instrument of power, still was. They were very satisfied that this authoritarian instrument in which they had recently thought to discover symptoms of nationalistic contamination, proved to be completely trustworthy. The Pharisees who have been tortured by the nightmare of an imminent revolt, can now heave a sigh of relief that their last hour has not struck yet.

The official reason given for this sensational raid, was that the authorities had serious indications that there existed in the circles of P.N.I. the intention to invite organised riot and rebellion on New Year's Eve. In order to find out the truth about this matter, this massive search of houses had been organised.

It goes without saying that the ever-stirring reactionary white press tried to cash in on this event. In all keys they sang their song that now was the time to stop the P.N.I.'s activity once and for all. *Het Algemeen Handelsblad* demanded simply: the introduction of true terrorism. And the spokesman of the notorious Patriotic Club, Mr. Fruin, asked the government in the General Council if the time had not come to make a public announcement that 'P.N.I. constituted an offence against a law'.

This sensational action was soon weakened by the announcement that the investigation of the car-load of seized papers did not yield any results. And now they tried to save this fiasco with the excuse that one does not tend to put plans for rebellion on paper. But how can they insist that plans for rebellion exist when nowhere during their search of houses a revolver or even an Indonesian knife was found?

Even the lengthy government declaration in the General Council on the 10th January did not answer that question. Not a single fact

was mentioned that could justify the brutal attack on the P.N.I. Again and again they referred to the rumours about a riot around New Year's Day 1930 which were supposed to have created a strained atmosphere. They also said that under the circumstances it would simply not have been responsible if the government had assumed a wait-and-see policy. In what way the government 'would have ignored one of its first duties, that is to ensure peace and quiet for the inhabitants. There was no time for hesitation. Above all the strained atmosphere had to be cleared. *Even though there was a chance that the material they were to collect would not completely confirm these suspicions. They could not run the risk that the intended riots would really break out.*'

The last sentence (in italics) completely invalidates the government's excuse of rumour. All this shows how the De Graeff regime puts into action the slogan 'gouverner, c'est prévoir' (to govern is to foresee), handling it with Machiavellian consistency.

Another remark in the statement mentioned shows what vague grounds the government committed this stupidity. On the one hand they acknowledged that some leaders of P.N.I. had often urged their supporters not to use any force and only fight their battle with legal means, but on the other hand it was said that other leaders and sometimes the same people but at other moments had either been silent even when suggestions in the other direction had been made or had spoken on courses or public meetings in words of an provocative nature even though they did not commit an offence against the law.

Who can make head or tail of this oracle of Delphi? Even silence is obviously not permitted. And how can they maintain that leaders have provoked their audience and yet have not committed an offence against the law? The wording of the Indonesian Criminal Legislation is so elastic and the stipulations intended to silence the people so numerous that the leaders would have been arrested a long time ago, if their words had really been of an inflammatory nature. Because the law says the following about penal offences, 'He who purposely expresses his views in words, writing or illustration, in such a way that whether indirectly, conditionally or in undercover ways the disturbance or overthrow of public order or the assault on the established authority in the Netherlands or Dutch Indonesia is advocated or creates the necessary atmosphere for this, is contravening the law'. It is obviously logically untenable on the part of the government to make these allegations!

But we are aware of it. There is no other acceptable motive for

the brutal assault on the P.N.I. than the fear of the latter's popularity and the spreading of its ideals of freedom to the masses. By this display of power they wanted to defile the party of the people in the eyes of the people in order to destroy in this way the influence it has on them. They also tried to create the opportunity to try and intimidate the population. But time will teach that it will not have the intended result. The *Oetoesan Sumatra* of the 22nd January commented that because of the assault P.N.I. had gained familiarity with the people. This party of the people has, within the short time of its existence, taken root too firmly in the Indonesian soil for it to be easily dislodged.

But all this will not come about without victims. The prestige of colonial authority requires obedience to their rules. And did not the Government Deputy of General Affairs say in the General Council that, if offenders are not prosecuted, this does not necessarily mean that internment will not be used? The reign of terror will probably cause the expulsion of some of the best leaders of P.N.I. in order to weaken this organisation and to pacify the souls of the startled Pharisees. Then the curtains will fall and another historical episode in our fight for freedom will be behind us.

It is less than three years ago now that the Digoel episode made us suffer and now we are experiencing yet another chapter of the martyrdom of our people on their road to a bright future. The series of afflictions that this poor people still have in score for them, before it reaches the promised land, does not seem to have come to an end. They will have to fight even harder and even more victims will fall as they approach the goal. It's a historical law that every fighter for the liberation of the people must be willing to undergo this ordeal. No true Indonesian nationalist will be able to avoid this. 'For the realisation of this sublime ideal – says the Turkish poetess Halide Edib Hanoem – many individuals have given their lives on the gallows, died in chains, suffered the tortures of exile, while carrying in their hearts the vision of their wounded country all the time. No audience has ever applauded their struggle and the humble fighters will continue to die for the good cause without ever gaining their goal. Their part in the struggle contains only fight and it may be called the ordeal for freedom'.

It is as if those lines were specially written for the martyrs of our freedom movement. 'There is expectation behind the sense of great loss.'

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, 1930.

14 The crisis of the P.P.P.K.I.

When about three years ago we greeted the foundation of the P.P.P.K.I. with enthusiasm, we had not the slightest idea that they would so soon have to go through a political crisis. We did not ignore the fact that this body would so soon have to fight against such great difficulties. We did not forget for one minute that the P.P.P.K.I. was far from being a homogeneous group, that they tried to unite parties which differed from each other in political principles. All the same we had hoped that they would have a lasting existence unlike the previous Radical Concentration, because the former was born under a lucky star politically speaking.

The P.P.P.K.I. started to grow in the time that the reactionaries reigned supreme, while the movement of the masses had not yet recovered from the feat of 1926 and 1927. A united advance of different parties that consisted of various sections of the population, was essential in order to give the masses back their self-confidence. As a favourable circumstance we would like to mention that the sharp contrast between nationalism and internationalism that used to have such painful consequences, was no longer in existence. The only controversy in principles was the one between 'non-cooperation' and 'cooperation'. But besides this difference in political principles there are a number of points of national interest which enabled a national programme of action to be drawn up. The abolition of penal sanctions and the statute labour, the abolition of the notorious articles in the criminal legislation which severely limit freedom of movement, the matter of hereditary tenure, the propaganda for a united Indonesia, the furtherance of national self-sufficiency – those are all satisfying objectives for a joint venture.

And last but not least, all this happened in the time that Colijn was engaged in organising a new offensive against the yet again growing national movement. He advocated a government display of power that would impress everybody. Against this threat of the

reactionaries the national movement had to consolidate itself into a body of defence and reconstruction. We regarded the growth of the P.P.P.K.I. as an attempt in this direction. Being their predecessors in the struggle for Indonesian unity, we were very pleased about the birth of the P.P.P.K.I. Of course we never fostered any illusion about the possibility of the melting together of all political parties into one great organisation, so that all party political differences of opinion would disappear! No, in that sense we never ever conceived the Indonesian concept of unity. It would be foolish to believe that the differences of opinion in Indonesian politics would cease to exist merely because of the birth of the P.P.P.K.I. Those believing in that possibility, move in the realms of dreams and fantasy. No country in the world, not even those having a fully united people, have such political unity. Indonesia would be a rare exception if it managed to perform such a miracle. But if such a thing were to happen, then we would begin to doubt the political discrimination of the Indonesian leaders and our people and then we would have reason to doubt our national future.

No, the Indonesian concept of freedom has nothing to do with unity of political thought. It entails the concept of a united Indonesia and a united Indonesian people. The propaganda for unity must occupy itself with the education of the masses to be Indonesian citizens; the sections of the population living on the various islands must be given the awareness that they belong to one and the same nation, the Indonesian. They must try to bring about the realisation of the generally acknowledged principle of the national ideal, namely that nationalism is a belief held by a fairly large number of individuals, that they constitute a nationality; it is a sense of belonging together as a nation.

The propaganda of unity has the task of strengthening the feeling of solidarity of Indonesians and if necessary to awaken them. This is the meaning of the Indonesian concept of unity! The feeling of solidarity bears no realation to the unity of political principle. If political unity were to be the norm for Indonesian unity, then this unity would never come about.

Our joy at the rising of the P.P.P.K.I. as a kind of Political Concentration was mainly caused by the hope we had that this body would develop into a representative organ of the Indonesian people and into a real Indonesian National Parliament, in which the will of the people would be voiced. It lies in the power of both parties of the people, the P.N.I. and P.S.I.I., to enable the P.P.P.K.I. to run

its natural course. This body would also be useful for bridging the great gap between the organisations of Indonesian civil servants and intellectuals and the masses and bring them into contact with each other via the P.P.P.K.I., while the intellectuals would be forced to support the demands of the people that occur on the joint programme, which they would never have come round to of their own accord.

Those were the visions we had when we expressed our joy at the rising of the P.P.P.K.I.

It is two years later now. Instead of consolidation of national power, we have seen how even more confusion of political ideologies has arisen and we can detect symptoms of a coming crisis. Whatever is the reason for all this?

A superficial observer of the Indonesian national movement, or a dreamer of a policy of unity would probably ask us with astonishment what right we have to speak of a crisis in the P.P.P.K.I. He would point out to us the irrefutable fact that recently everywhere and almost at every meeting or gathering there are discussions about unity. He would remind us of how the youth organisations, who until recently have been very pruoud of their island of origin, now hastily broke up to join the powerful stream of the movement for unity. And they would ask us even more questions. Does not the foundation of the National Fonds of the P.P.P.K.I. meet with approval and encouragement everywhere? Has not progress gone so far as to enable them to draw up a plan for a grand national building at Surabaya? And is it not true that we hear more and more of the P.P.P.K.I. recently and less and less of the separate parties? And does not there exist, even among the older people who only used to discuss politics, a tendency to unity in policy and action? So do you persist in your pessimism?

One cannot deny these facts! But they cannot hide the symptoms of crisis of a serious nature in the P.P.P.K.I. One is struck by two facts; there is an ideological crisis and a manifestation of impotence.

Where the former is concerned ideological confusions have arisen since many people in the P.P.P.K.I. have come to believe that the concept of unity must also be realised in politics. At present there is a tendency to make of P.P.P.K.I. a super-organisation instead of developing it into a National Parliament in which the will of the people is voiced and in which differences in opinion need not be suppressed. They seem to forget the value of the proverb, that 'eventually the truth will materialise from a clash of opinions'.

The P.P.P.K.I. is based on the following fundamental principles:

1. The political parties that form part of the P.P.P.K.I. will not make propaganda in such words and actions as could be painful for the other societies nor will any member *pass* improper (the italics are ours) criticism on any other members of the P.P.P.K.I.
2. All disputes will be settled amicably, with the P.P.P.K.I. as arbitrator.

When one does not interpret these formulae too dogmatically, then the P.P.P.K.I. does not hinder a profound discussion about partly principles, nor would it prevent the mental development of the society members. When a unity of political sorts is out of the question, then differences in opinion are bound to occur. For a political organisation develops all the more because of continual propaganda and unceasing exposition of its principles. How can one convince others of the value of those principles if one cannot criticise or dispute the opposite opinion? How could one strengthen the belief of the masses in the inward power of non-cooperation, if one could not further at the same time the uselessness and disadvantages of the cooperation policy? Failing to do this would cause confusion in the minds of the masses. Such tactics are only apt to make party members into uncritical human beings, into a bleating herd following after each clever speaker.

But it is not criticism that is forbidden by the first of the mentioned formulae but improper criticism. Criticism is not only allowed, but is even necessary. It is a stimulant for the development of insight into one's own principles. It preserves us from superficiality. The meaning of the P.P.P.K.I. must be found in the fact that we remain rational however much they are criticised. It is their part to prevent that criticism from degenerating into insinuations, just as normally happens in Dutch political life.

Only in this way can one gradually shape Indonesian political opinion and improve the development of political awareness of the masses. If the P.P.P.K.I. saw this as their task, they would be established as firmly as a rock and would be able to survive many a political storm.

But unfortunately the dogmatic concept of unity has penetrated into the P.P.P.K.I. They tried to delude themselves and the outer world that there can be unity in everything, unity of opinion and unity of spirit. They try to suppress all criticism, instead of recognising the constructive power of it. They mistake a virtue for a disease or vice versa a disease for a virtue. In the P.N.I. it is now

come to the point that the editorial committee of their party newspaper felt called upon the disavow a fellow member, who had dared to criticise Dr. Soetomo for the latter's remark about the taking over the work of the P.N.I., on the grounds that such criticism could disturb unity. Yet this criticism was well-founded and objectively formulated. They seem to forget that while trying to attain unity among the leaders, they endanger unity in the party. What would happen to the unity in the P.P.P.K.I. if there were a split in, for instance, the P.N.I.? The P.P.P.K.I. can only be powerful and gain respect as a political centre of power, when the parties that make up the P.P.P.K.I. are vigorously organised. Therefore the first duty of the member parties is to strengthen themselves. This truth is often lost in the disfigured ideal of unity. The shift of activities from the separate parties to the P.P.P.K.I. on which they pride themselves as a proof of increasing power and consolidated unity, we can only regard as a sham manoeuvre. For there can only be actual increasing activity, when this phenomenon can be found in the member parties, so that the activity at the top is merely the consequence of it. This sham manoeuvre also creates the chance that under the pretext of unity fundamental differences of opinion are hidden away, so that the potential growth of the party is nipped in the bud. In this way they attain ideological confusion instead of the unattainable policy of unity, which will eventually revenge itself on the P.P.P.K.I. We are supporters of Indonesian unity, even of a contained unity, but not of a unity at all costs, at the expense of the basic principles.

The tragedy of the present misconception of unity is that too often nowadays criticism is regarded as an attempt to destroy unity. This does not attain a better understanding or greater tolerance within the party, but on the contrary a needlessly increasing bitterness. Eventually this dogmatic concept of unity will lead to the inward paralysis of the whole national movement. In the long run this will produce a P.P.P.K.I. that outwardly shows great splendour but is inwardly fragile.

What is more important politically is the symptom of crisis that manifests itself in the inability of the P.P.P.K.I. to show solidarity with their left wing that is being attacked, the P.N.I. And this puts the solidity of their principles severely to the test. It is evidence that they have lost much of their influence as a body of resistance against the colonial reactionaries.

The power of the P.P.P.K.I. only seems to function in sham

fights, where the P.N.I. had to endure threats and warnings from the government and when all the colonial reactionaries have been set against the P.P.P.K.I. Then even the Boedi Oetomo could bring themselves to a declaration of solidarity with the P.N.I. We remember very clearly the manifesto of the P.P.P.K.I. of the 30th May 1928 in which it took a stand against the Governor-General who in his speech at the opening of the General Council tried to separate the P.N.I. from the rest of the national movement. This action left a deep impression!

But when the P.N.I. was strongly attacked on the 29th December 1929 the P.P.P.K.I. could only demonstrate its impotence. True, when shortly afterwards a protest meeting was organised at Batavia – probably at some other places too –, in which declarations of solidarity with the P.N.I. were made, but nothing else was undertaken beyond these words. Since that time nothing more has been heard of a protest action organised by the P.P.P.K.I. Only Mr. Thamrin stood up for the P.N.I. in the General Council, when it was being suggested to the meeting to declare this party a forbidden society, without a decision from the highest lawcourt as prescribed by the law.

If the moderate parties had been serious in their solidarity with the P.N.I., then they should have withdrawn their representatives from the General Council in protest against the assault and they should have broken off their cooperation with the authorities, just as Patel did in India when Gandhi was arrested. That kind of action would have made an impression on friend and foe. All the world would have respected the moral power of the P.P.P.K.I. and the solidity of its principles.

But it is this very proof of moral power and a firm solidarity that is not forthcoming! And with that one of the seemingly strong pillars of the P.P.P.K.I. crumbled as if it were brittle stone. The other actions of the P.P.P.K.I. are only fit to distract the attention of the Indonesian public from the burning questions of the moment, the P.N.I. The campaign was organised for the benefit of National Fund which drew attention everywhere and met with enormous approval. Thousands of guilders flowed into the funds of the P.P.P.K.I. They also brought up the point of the improvement of the social security of the people. Politics fell into the background completely and as well the whole atmosphere in Indonesia at the moment was absolutely dominated by it. And so after the attack on the P.N.I. the active struggle has been replaced by the line of least resistance.

And that proves to us that we must not regard the recently increased activity of the P.P.P.K.I. as a sign of consolidation of national politics, but rather as signs of an internal crisis.

But that is not all! Of late the Indonesian newspapers have reported the efforts of Dr. Soetomo, leader of the Surabajase Study Club and Chairman of the P.P.P.K.I. to bring about a fusion between his party, the P.N.I. and the Sarikat Madoera. The new party emerging from this fusion would then come under his leadership. And that would mean the end of existence for the P.N.I.

It is said that some leading figures of the P.N.I. who did not get involved in the present law-suit, felt sympathy for this idea. But protests were made within the party expressed, for instance, in the form of letters to the editors of the party newspaper, the *Persatoean Indonesia.* The writers wondered whether it was not very ungrateful to Ir. Soekarno and others who had sacrified so much for the P.N.I.? They considered it improper that instead of continuing their labour, their spiritual child that they had brought up with so much care and love, to bury it alive even before their case had been tried. Outside the P.N.I. too this idea was not appreciated. It was considered against the political code to try and cash in politically on the difficulties of the P.N.I.

Of course we do not know what decision the leaders of P.N.I. will ultimately take. Maybe the resistance from within the party against the plans for a fusion will make an impression on them. But this much is certain, that such a fusion would bring about a split in the P.N.I. Whether this will benefit the P.P.P.K.I. in the end, is highly doubtful. That part of the members of P.N.I. faithful to their principles who will keep up their morale, will probably sever their ties with the P.P.P.K.I. And then it is questionable whether the P.S.I.I. will want to stay within the P.P.P.K.I. without the P.N.I. Already they are continually in conflict with the Study Club.

So it would seem that the latest tendency to political unity in the Indonesian national movement can only result in eating away the P.P.P.K.I.

So this is the serious character of the present crisis: in Indonesian politics which does not however seem to be evident to the outside world. What kind of situation will emerge from this crisis cannot be foreseen at this present moment. It is the question of the future!

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka,* 1930.

15 Non-cooperation

'For it is a characteristic of eternal humanity, that even the newest and most modern inventions are only a different form of something old and past, a logical extension of an old principle.'

Father J. L. Callewaert *(translated from the Dutch)*

The matter of non-cooperation is drawing everybody's attention again now that the civil disobedience movement in India is increasing in size as never before. Future historians will be able to determine whether this movement is in the beginning of the war of liberation of India, comparable to for instance the eighty years war with Holland and Spain and also whether the decision of the Congress of Lahore of December 1929 is not comparable to the union of Utrecht in which the Dutch nation had its origin. We will not occupy ourselves with historical comparisons, which with a great variety of data are often inaccurate. However one thing is certain. Peace and quiet will not return to India before the independence of this country has become an accomplished fact. The country of the great Mahatma has come to a period of 'permanent revolution'. An indication of this is the statement of Pandit Motilal Nehru, who is a moderate man by nature, that even a dominion status for India is not acceptable any more and that nationalist India is only willing to negotiate with England about the way the colonial situation will be liquidated, if they are to be regarded as independent partners. We are just as sure that the non-cooperation movement will acquire increasingly greater support in the liberation side of the Asiatic people. It is the weapon par excellence for every oppressed people that is faced in its attempt at emancipation with the superior power of fire and steel of the white usurpers. As in the past the future will prove that only non-cooperation can free the Eastern peoples from the tyranny of the West.

The colonial oppression has had such a disorganising and demoralising effect on the life of the native people that the national

salvation can only come from the oppressed masses themselves. If we want to restore the personality of a nation then we have to start by instilling into their minds a sense of self-esteem. That cannot be achieved by scoring doubtful successes in cooperation with the ruler which moreover merely shows one's helplessness. Only self-sufficiency based on the inward power of the people can have a purifying effect on the process of national self-review. The policy of cooperation does not breed self-confidence, but only doubt foremost and a feeling of impotence in the dominated people. They reconcile the people with what is eternally unbearable. The tremendous energy hidden in the masses, is thus led along paths that are without danger for the ruler and without effect for them. Compromises are made, which are not mutual concessions, but merely the obstinate assertion of the will of the ruler according to a method which in the eyes of the ruled appears less brutal. This encourages weakness and that in its turn increases the tendency to resignation. The policy of cooperation is the policy of increased helplessness!

Gradually we are beginning to understand that the policy of cooperation means self-deception. The essential element in the colonial situation is the contrast of interests between the ruler and the ruled. On the one hand there is the desire for self-determination of the ruled and on the other the endeavours of the ruler to maintain power. How can those two ever be reconciled?

In spite of all theories of good will from the colonisers, the hard reality has given us a number of examples of how freedom needs to be won by a struggle against and not in collaboration with the ruler who is raping that very freedom. The English feel obliged to stipulate reserves with respect to the independence of Egypt and as the Guardian of a millenarian tradition they also have to resist the demand for independence from India, in spite of all their fine promises in the past. They too don't hesitate to put a bloody stop to a legitimate movement of Indians for their national freedom, if they think that the interests of the 'British Empire' and 'British prestige' are paramount. We have seen how a Labour government begins to feel 'all British' when they are concerned with giving up usurped rights with which they have systematically oppressed and exploited peoples of centuries-old civilisations. It may be an irony of fate but it is a fact that a socialist government tramples underfoot the principle of the right of self-determination of peoples for which their own organisation and their own International has stood

up with tenacity. The history of our century testifies how Western socialism gradually passes from the defender to the rapist of the right of self-determination, from ally to oppressor of the coloured people.

The colonial drama that is now taking place in the river basin of the Indus, will probably open the eyes of the unsuspecting to the truth that the realisation of the National Ideal is not possible by a policy of cooperation with the tyrant, whether the latter's representative may call himself a capitalist or a socialist. For anybody who is willing to understand and see the facts speak for themselves. When even a socialist government is not trustworthy, what other government can be trusted? For the umpteenth time what we proclaimed more than six years ago has come true; 'Cooperation is only possible between two groups with equal rights and duties and with communal interests. When these conditions are not fulfilled, the oppression of the weaker party by the stronger, and the abuse of one as an instrument by the other on behalf of their own interests'. In all those policies of so-called cooperation one will always find that the speed of colonial political development is simply determined by the dominator and is never the result of an agreement between the ruler and the ruled. The policy of cooperation lowers a human being to a tale-bearer of the tyrant. Never has history produced a precedent, that a conquered nation regains its freedom with the aid of the ruler himself!

We will begin with an example near at hand! The Netherlands had liberated themselves, not by cooperation with Spain, but by denial and non-recognition of the Spanish rulers; not by gradually recovering the jobs in the Spanish-Dutch administration, but by the foundation of their own national edifice and by counting on the powers that were present in their own nation. The Netherlands at that time had by non-cooperation and by an absolute negation of all that was Spanish, recovered their own nature, and in the end managed to throw off the Spanish yoke. It is curious though that many Dutchmen with a social conscience who say they recognize Indonesia's right to demand independence, condemn the Indonesian non-cooperation as inexpedient, thus showing that they are not familiar with their own national history.

Of course, the Dutch fighting methods of those days long past were different in nature from those of the non-cooperators of today. For indeed the circumstances are quite different. But the forces behind both movements are essentially similar. No cooperation but resistance against the ruler was and is the pass-word!

Considering the freedom movements of recent times, we first find Ireland that managed to extort home rule from England, by fighting independently against Great Britain. It was the power of non-cooperation that Sinn Fein, who managed to make a breach in the supreme position of Albion, propagated passionately. After decades of Redmondian policy of graduality in England's good faith, the Irish finally came to the conclusion, 'that the constitutional agitation had proved inexpedient'. Even the demand for dominion status, which would preserve the political tie with England, was refused. The Irish realised that there was no hope of obtaining political independence in that way. And so in the end John Redmond himself who had urged his people to loyalty and cooperation with England all his life, only escaped general contempt and abuse from the people by his premature death.[1]

The policy of Sinn Fein was based, not on the recognition of a usurping power but on the denial of that authority: not on the support of Ireland's enemies, but on the action of self-confident and independent men.[2] This principle had already been expressed a long time ago by one of the most important leaders of the previous century, James Fintan Lalor. He said among other things:
'The principles I state and mean to stand upon this (social system) that the entire ownership of Ireland moral and material up to the sun and down to the center, is vested of right in the people of Ireland; that they and none but they are the landowners and lawmakers of this island; that all laws are null and void not made by them and all titles to land invalid not conferred and confirmed by them; and this full right of ownership may and ought to be asserted and enforced by any and all means which God has put in the power of man'.

This terse statement was the starting point of the Sinn Fein movement. The Sinn Feinism – 'we ourselves' – was therefore the political expression of the slogan that Ireland was a nation with all resulting consequences.

A long time before Ghandi's preaching on non-cooperation the Irish worked out, propagated and applied this policy. It was Arthur Griffith, a well-known theorist of Sinn Feinism, who first advocated the policy of 'abstinence and passive resistance' for Ireland. He had got into contact with this policy by the study of the Hungarian emancipation movement, under the leadership of Franz Déak. In the latter's brochure, titled 'The Hungarian Policy' which was published in 1902, he demonstrated how Hungary had been able to

shake off the Austrian domination without any force, merely by disavowing Austria.[3] 'This new (Irish) policy – wrote Father J. L. Callewaert – was no longer neutral in its attitude towards the various existing Irish parties, but declared war on the parliamentary party and urged the people to deny the degrading and demoralising policy of the parliamentarian their support, till they would give up their presence in Westminster, in order to give their help at home to the furtherance of Irish interests and national rights.'[4]

Initially, this non-cooperation policy had little success because the people had been poisoned by John Redmond's policy of faith in the English. 'The herds of unsuspecting, orthodox people have kept their faith in the promise of Home Rule, which for them meant the independence they so long dreamed of'.[5] But by intensive propaganda and their clear exposition of the non-cooperation principle the Sinn Fein people soon succeeded in tipping the balance in their favour. And by the end of the war Sinn Fein had become the voice of the feelings of almost all of the people.

If anybody still doubts the truth that only a policy of non-cooperation can win the confidence of the people in a dominated country and move the masses, then there is enough proof in the history of the Irish movement to confirm this.

The non-cooperation concept had been more fully developed here than it has been in any other colony up to this time. But the Irish did not limit themselves to be boycotting of all that was English, but they even proceeded to constitute their own national parliament, the 'Dail Eireann', as the embodiment of the national will and national supremacy.[6] The announcement of this event took place on the 21st January 1919 in the town hall of Dublin, while at the same time a Declaration of Independence was sent to almost all independent nations of the world.[7] The foundation of this national parliament was based on the same principle as that on which England itself had based its constitution; government by consent of the governed. And with this Albion was morally outdone. When the explicit will of the people desires such a national parliament, then the legal status of this foundation is ensured by virtue of their wish. This formation of their own representative body, independent of the influence of the ruler, has proved to be the best parliamentary education for an oppressed people. Only in this way can responsibility be encouraged. How justified the Irish decision was is shown by the fact that the Irish parliament has grown into the present Dail Eireann. A national government was chosen as the

holder of executive power with De Valera as the President of the Republic and Prime Minister at the same time. Moreover arbitrary lawcourts were established everywhere in the country, to administer justice in all national disputes.[8] For years, since the 25th November 1913, Ireland had possessed a national voluntary movement as the symbol of the national defence. 'It was founded on the basis of national unity, national dignity, national and individual freedom and courageous citizenship. It was the start of the foundation, not of a local but of a national voluntary army for Ireland's absolute and complete freedom.'[9] Sinn Fein regarded these volunteers who were not part of their organisation as 'useful help in the task of developing the only quality that could ensure eventual success, namely the self-confidence and the moral determination of the Irish people'.[10]

Thus the Irish, through their non-cooperation, formed a state within a state, in order to pursue their national ideal. And with reason the enthusiatic French authoress Simone Téry remarked: 'The Irish nation was born'. –

It was the unyielding will of the Irish nation, awoken by non-cooperation, which eventually forced England to capitulate and to recognize Home Rule for Ireland. Naturally sly Albion has not given up its old trick of divide-and-rule untried. It has succeeded in permanently dividing Ireland into more or less hostile camps: the Irish Free State and Ulster and moreover in splitting up Sinn Fein itself at the expense of absolute and complete independence.

But all the same recent history has clearly shown, the will of the nation can do as it wants and what power there is in non-cooperation as a *political weapon.* 'Non-cooperation – Palme Dutt rightly says – is the attempt to force the government to submit by the use of the masses. There is no question of a gentle, persuasive, spiritual argument. It is a question of *power*'.[11]

It is noteworthy that the paternity of non-cooperation is always attributed to Ghandi, in spite of the fact that the Sinn Fein as a movement put it into practice some time before him. It is true that Ghandi started his action in South Africa approximately at the same time as Griffith in Ireland, but it acquired the character of a national movement only when it was planted in Indian soil in 1920. There is an essential difference between Ghandi's activities in South Africa and his political action in India, although both spring from the same principle, that Ghandi prefers to call 'soul-force' rather than 'passive resistance'.[12]

But today if non-cooperation is mentioned, then one almost always thinks of the Mahatma and identifies with his doctrine the doctrine of *Satyagraha* and *Ahimsa* which do indeed contain elements of predominantly Hindu origins. With this specific non-cooperation in mind, the unsuspecting Westerner may tend to condemn other non-cooperative movements such as the one in Indonesia which however lack the same religious foundation. The same confusion makes the social democrat Van der Zee also make this mistake in his two articles in *Het Volk* on the 18th and 19th of July of this year about 'non-cooperation'. One will seldom find such superficiality, in the treatment of such a comprehensive problem of this kind, as in his treatise. Although he is not taken by the idea of non-cooperation he considers it understandable in India because Western materialism particularly clashes with and threatens the Hindu soul. 'It was essentially the clash between East and West', he said, 'which had to led to a manifestation and in no way the desire for political liberation which is aimed at by the non-cooperative movement in British India'. The oppressed popular soul needed only one word to burst into action. 'This key-word was non-cooperation: refuse every cooperation with British institutions, refuse the products of Western civilisation, especially refuse the Western produced materials and dress again in our own material just as our ancestors did in the free past. And if you strictly carry through this non-cooperation, then British imperialism will die through this non-cooperation, then British imperialism will die from lack of blood and it will crumble without you having to use force.'

Mr. Van der Zee considers non-cooperation absolutely out of place in *Indonesia* for, as he says, 'the great Hindu aspiration which gave Ghandi his organised millions naturally does not exist here'. The Indonesian non-cooperation is nothing more than a political phenomenon and is therefore, according to him, dangerous. 'Basically this non-cooperation is nothing more than the expression of the fundamental gulf between East and West'. But he forgets to add that the basic cause of the East-West antithesis is the West itself, that has developed and degenerated as a result of the oppression and exploitation of peaceful coloured people. Not only in India, as Mr. Van der Zee points out, but everywhere in the East the individualistic-naturalistic West clashes with the native culture of the East, threatens and destroys it. All over the East, resistance against the West has grown from the same source.

It is basically inaccurate to imagine that there is a fundamental

difference between the so-called religious non-cooperation and political non-cooperation. It is pure deception of the uncritical public, which cannot be condemned enough. For nowhere non-cooperation is applied unrelated to politics without the thought of political independence.

All the non-cooperative movements have this fundamental principle in common, that they preach indifference towards the councils that have been established by the ruler and which are anything but representative of the people and that they encourage self-sufficiency resulting in denial of the ruler. It is true the non-cooperation in India may have stemmed from the Hindu religion which encouraged it greatly, but this does not mean that it lacks this inspiring power in other countries. Here it has become a political creed, with which the hidden powers of the people are drummed up for the national freedom fight. We have seen how Ireland, which completely lacks the Hindu inspiration, rapidly approached its goal when it had taken non-cooperation as its means. That the inspiring power of the Indian non-cooperation would exclusively emanate from the Hindu religion, has been proved wrong by the facts of this time. For Ghandi too, non-cooperation can be different from just religion. This is evident from his own statement of 1922 in which he said:

'The Non-Cooperators are at war with the Government and compel its submission to the people's will. We shall have to stagger humanity, even as South Africa and Ireland with this exception – we will rather spill our own blood, not that of our opponents. *This is a fight to a finish.*'

And in his Manifesto of December 1921 he declared outspokenly:

'I am a man of peace, but not of peace at any price – only of that peace which will enable us to stand up to the world as free men.'

This statement leaves no room for doubt. And we see how the Indian non-cooperation movement increases in power, not that it subordinates religion and ethics to politics. This development can only be impeded by Ghandi who is the promotor of it with his inward discrepancy, who intervenes when the movement is in the process of spreading its wings. As a political creed non-cooperation is an inexhaustible source of power.

For all its supporters non-cooperation stands for both criticism and development, construction and reconstruction. It sharpens the colonial antithesis, marks the division between ruler and ruled, outwardly serving as a repellant and inwardly as a unifier. It

views all things from the point of view of self-confidence and independence. It rejects the substitution-idea, which is based on the assumption that national independence could be achieved by gradually replacing the white civil servant of the colonial administration by native people. It rejects the so-called policy of Indonesianising etc. as self-deception, because such substitution can have no other result than that the people unknowingly adapt to the colonial system that is intent on the maintenance of colonial authority. For it is a well-known fact that Western colonisation did not take place to bring modern democracy to the East but only for the sake of exploitation of foreign lands. The colonial form of Government is required to answer the purpose. One look at the various forms of constitution of democracy in the West is sufficient to recognise how far for instance the pyramid system of government in Indonesia deviates from that. The wide bottom part of this government pyramid consists of native elements, which at the same time form the link between the ruler and the masses while at the top the dominator is situated with his own parliament in the mother country, which in the last resort determines the fortunes of the colony. Even if the colony adapts to this system then this does not mean that it acquires the right of self-determination or that it can practise its own parliamentary government. Between the colonial form of government and a parliamentary form of democracy there is a deep rift. Cooperation for the maintenance and development of this system makes one a traitor to oneself. Only a very small group of native intellectuals and civil servants profit by this policy of cooperation, while the masses remain as unprivileged as ever.

It sounds very strange when Mr. Van der Zee claims that 'self-sufficiency which the non-cooperators aim at, cannot develop naturally, because it eliminates the organs set up for this exact purpose (*sic.*)'. He knows just as well as anyone else that the general council and other such councils are not in the least representative of the people and that self-sufficiency is an impossibility in those foreign councils. But above all we have seen in Ireland, how it was because of the very act of eliminating the institutions of the rulers that self-sufficiency could grow naturally.

That non-cooperation would slow down the arrival of political freedom, as Mr. Van der Zee boldly states, is to say the least, a mistake, because the history of recent times confirms the exact opposite. While judging the colonial freedom movement he has taken too many examples from the policy of the Social Democrats, which

gradually as their influence grows will learn to adapt to the capitalist system. And thus the present social democracy has become a movement with internal and external contradictions, a movement in which there is very little socialism.

Even less sound is the statement of Mr. Van der Zee – in imitation of his party member J. E. Stokvis[13] – that non-cooperation is an expression of anarchism, against which he sets the policy of the Social Democrats who are succeeding in wresting from this, which enabled them to develop a powerful political influence. Those of you who realise the meaning of the non-cooperation policy, will soon notice, what narrow-mindedness there is behind this opinion. The boycott of the council set up by the ruler is not an expression of anarchism, nor a sign of aversion to the parliamentary system: rather, it is a testimony of respect for the constitutional democracy which is systematically ridiculed and assaulted by the dominator.

Like most defenders of the cooperation policy, Mr. Van der Zee has not managed to avoid a tragic mistake in his argument. If he condemns non-cooperation and disqualifies it as a party of sentiment, then he must at the same time admit that in Indonesia this very principle is supported by the two largest parties, the P.S.I.I. and the P.N.I., the two parties of the Indonesian masses. Since he himself belongs to a mass party, the S.D.A.P., – doesn't it strike him as odd that only the non-cooperation that he condemns, can appeal so strongly to the Indonesian masses and can win their confidence? He could find sufficient practical proof, that the parties in Indonesia which advocate the policy of cooperation, are weak and spineless parties, with no popular support. They're little parties of the national bourgeoisie, of the politically muzzled Indonesian civil servants or intellectuals, for whom the mass movement has no attraction. After all they're groups that cannot really contribute to the national fight for freedom. For the real national movement is and can only be the fight of the masses and of that part of the bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, who can be of service to the national struggle as organisers and agitators of the mass movement.

It is sufficiently evident from the recent history of India, that the Indian national movement only became popular with the masses, when Ghandi appeared on the political scene with his non-cooperation. With this policy he touched the heart of the masses and let them move to action. 'This achievement of Ghandi – says Palme Dutt – is bigger than all the idiosyncrasies and weaknesses which

may be brought against him, and constitutes his real contribution to Indian nationalism'.[14]

And we have seen how six years ago the masses turned away from Ghandi, when he capitulated for the now deceased cooperation leader Das. And now we can see how the Indian masses have turned to the Mahatma again now that he has made himself the leader of the civil disobedience group fighting for free India.

The past has shown us that non-cooperation was the most effective means to extort the right of self-determination. It will be no different in the future. With this weapon the oppressed peoples of Asia will triumph in the fight for national independence.

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, July 1930, no. 4.

1. See Sylvain Briollay, *L'Irlande insurgée*, p. 15.
2. Father J. L. Callewaert, *Ierland en het Ierse Volk*, p. 576.
3. See Sylvain Briollay, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
4. Father J. L. Callewaert, *op. cit.*, p. 572.
5. Father J. L. Callewaert, *op. cit.*, p. 577.
6. Father J. L. Callewaert, *op. cit.*, p. 624.
7. See Simone Téry, *En Irlande*, p. 43 and 44 in which the complete contents of this declaration of Independence, translated into French, can be found.
8. See Sylvain Briollay, *op. cit.*, p. 53-60.
9. Father J. L. Callewaert, *op. cit.*, p. 591.
10. Father J. L. Callewaert, *op. cit.*, p. 592.
11. *Modern India*, p. 73.
12. Compare C. F. Andrews, *Mahatma Ghandi's ideas*, p. 193 *et sqq.* An important book to gain an insight into the mind and soul of Mahatma Ghandi.
13. See his article in *Het Volk* of 3rd July 1928 about 'the first congress of the Partij Nasional Indonesia'.
    In *Het Volk* of the 19th July of this year Mr. Daan Van der Zee continues his fight against non-cooperation in an article titled 'Het juiste standpunt' (The Proper Point of View). He starts by praising his favourite comrade J. E. Stokvis (who if it came to it would be willing to act as crown witness against Perhimpoenan Indonesia in aid of the arch enemy of all Indonesia nationalists, *Het Nieuws van den Dag*, as was evident from his recent interview in this newspaper) and ends up with a lamentation that 'the militant (Indonesian) nationalist, whose entire action is directed towards this (national) liberation, does not offer the Social Democrats any help in their difficult position (in the General Council) against the Government and other European groups in Indonesian politics'. Dear, oh dear, shouldn't we pity these poor devils? They would so like to be our benefactors! Has Stokvis not repeated often enough that we should be grateful to them?
    Now Mr. Van der Zee wants to tell us the truth. Listen well: 'That (namely non-cooperation) is basically nothing else than the demonstration of political incapability (*sic.*). And if the liberation of colonial territories did not keep with world liberation from capitalism (well, well, and that is why the

English Labour government supports English colonial capitalism and beats down the Indian freedom movement) then these nationalists only deserve to be left to their own political foolishness'.
Doesn't that make you shudder? Well, maybe this will not please Mr. Van der Zee, that on our part we would like to make it clear that the entire people's movement in Indonesia – and that is the non-cooperation movement – would like nothing more than to be left to its 'own political foolishness' and that it curses the interference of the Indian social democrats in Indonesian social politics. The sooner these gentlemen stop spreading confusion and disappear, the better for us. Why don't they mind their own business?

14. *Modern India*, p. 72.

16 The political meaning of non-cooperation

1

Since Ghandi's people started their civil disobedience campaign, non-cooperation has become a subject of conversation and writing. Mr. Daan van der Zee, the 'colonial specialist' of the S.D.A.P., felt called upon to upbraid the public with his opinion about this problem, since he had noted that some people in one of the branches of his party did not find this strong weapon of the Asian colonial territories so condemnable. This happened in some two articles, titled 'Non-cooperation' in *Het Volk* on the 18th and 19th of June, followed later on by an article 'Het juiste standpunt' in *Het Volk* of the 19th of July, in which he sharply condemned non-cooperation and advocated a policy of 'cooperation with the colonial dominator.'

On the public, which is not familiar with the details of the matter, these articles make some impression, especially because of the suggestive tone in which they are written. But for those who are aware of the nature and the development of the non-cooperation movement, they betray a rare superficiality.

Mr. Van der Zee makes a fundamental distinction between non-cooperation in India with its originally religious – Hindu – foundation and the non-cooperation in Indonesia which is nothing but a political phenomenon.

The latter he sharply condemns for 'the great Hindu aspiration, which Ghandi passed on to his organised millions is lacking here'. And according to him this is dangerous, because it is essentially nothing but a fundamental aggravation of the chasm between East and West. 'Basically this non-cooperation is nothing more than the expression of the fundamental gulf between East and West'. That the West itself is responsible for the existence of this chasm, he obviously does not realise. He would rather blame the oppressed

themselves and thus he can easily condemn non-cooperation, as it is practised in Indonesia by the P.N.I. and the P.S.I.I., the two largest parties of those that find support in the masses.

For *India* however he finds non-cooperation understandable, although he does not agree with it and welcomes the policy of the Indian *liberals*, who diminish the effect of the struggle of the masses by cooperation with the British tyrant. He feels non-cooperation is justified in India, because the naturalistic West clashed here with the East, especially with the Hindu soul whose subtleness is violated. 'It is essentially the clash between East and West', he said – 'which has led to a manifestation *and in no way to a desire for political freedom* (*sic.*, the italics are ours), which is aimed for by the non-cooperation movement in British India (he means Indian-India)... The oppressed popular soul needed only one word to burst into action... This keyword was non-cooperation: refuse the products of Western civilisation; refuse especially the Western produced materials and dress again in our own material just as our ancestors did in the free past. And if you strictly carry through this non-cooperation, *then British imperialism will die from lack of blood and it will crumble without you having to use force*' (the italics are ours).

One only need compare the two italicised passages from the quotation to detect the contradiction in the argument of Mr. Van der Zee, which to top it all, are only separated by three sentences.

How can one say that non-cooperation is 'in no way the desire for political liberation', and then continue with the statement that the goal of non-cooperation is death of British imperialism?

Does the endeavour to cause the disappearance of British imperialism not imply a desire for political liberation? Who can make head or tail of this!

To make a fundamental distinction between the so-called *religious* non-cooperation and *political* cooperation is inaccurate and only serves to cause confusion. *For nowhere non-cooperation is applied unrelated to politics, without the thought of political independence.*

The clash between East and West does not only exist in India which Mr. Van der Zee especially drew attention to, but in all of the East, where Western imperialism has penetrated. All over the East resistance to Western imperialism has emerged from the same sources. Ghandi, the founder of Indian non-cooperation, also wants to make his movement, in spite of its religious foundations, sub-

servient to the liberation of India. This is evident from his declaration of 1922, in which he said among other things:
'The Non-Cooperators are at war with the Government and compel its submission to the people's will. We shall have to stagger humanity, even as South Africa and Ireland with this exception – we will rather spill our own blood, not that of our opponents. This is a fight to a finish'.

We would advise Mr. Van der Zee to read Ghandi's book *Young India*, especially his letter of the 4th August 1920 to the Viceroy, on the occasion of the inauguration of the non-cooperation movement, where he will find that *politics* are at the basis of non-cooperation.

To help him rectify his mistake that the 'great Hindu aspiration' would be the only driving power of non-cooperation, we would like to suggest that he studies the history of the Irish freedom movement, embodied in the Sinn Fein. Then he will see that non-cooperation has been sucessfully applied as a political weapon.

It was non-cooperation that succeeded in stirring the resigned Irish masses into action, self-confidence and self-sufficiency.

And it was the non-cooperation movement, which finally managed to force powerful Albion to recognize Home Rule for Ireland, a success which the cooperation policy of leaders such as Redmond would never have been able to achieve. And he will also discover that the Irish labour party sided with Sinn Fein, *against* the cooperation party.

Mr. Van der Zee lacks the ability to gauge the deeper sense of non-cooperation. To him it is nothing but 'a confused nationalist policy, with a strongly negative character'. He does not seem to understand why non-cooperation has a power to inspire the masses and is capable of stirring the masses into action, to increase their vitality and endurance, without which the national liberation would not be possible.

It is true non-cooperation is also negative but only in the sense that it preaches aloofness towards the council set up by the dominator, which has nothing in common with a representation of the people. By ignoring these substitutions set up by the dominator one can bring down the power of the foreign authority. Thus non-cooperation outwardly works as a repellent; it marks the demarcation line between ruler and ruled.

But on the other hand non-cooperation has a strongly *positive* character because it urges the people to independence. This will instill self-confidence in the people and stimulate their urge for

action. What a source of power we would discover there! Non-cooperation is a real power to break the suggestion of inferiority and national impotence, which for years has been injected by the dominator into the minds of the people.

For lack of space I cannot go into the subject of the real nature of non-cooperation more fully. Those who are interested are referred to my *Indonesia Free* and to the latest July issue of *Indonesia Merdeka* the newspaper of Perhimpoenan Indonesia, from which much of the above has been borrowed.

2

In the second part of his article in *Het Volk* of 19th July Mr. Van der Zee criticises the Indonesian non-cooperation as follows:
'The self-sufficiency which non-cooperation aims at, can never develop naturally, *because it purposely eliminates the institutions set up for that purpose*' (the italics are ours, M.H.).

By the 'institutions set up for this purpose' he means the General Council, and the other local councils.

We wonder how it is possible, that somebody like Mr. Van der Zee can be serious when he says that the councils would be the institutions that could encourage the natural development of self-sufficiency. He must know that the Indonesians in those institutions do not get the opportunity for it. Self-sufficiency can only be achieved when there is a possibility to act independently.

Since the General Council is no parliament but only an advisory body, a change of responsibility between the colonial power and the Indonesian opposition is impossible.

It is the colonial government that acts and that can assert its authority at all times.

It is no different in the case of the Provincial Government Councils, in which the civil servant element is vastly in the majority.

In the present political situation in Indonesia the cooperation policy only means a submission to the colonial ruler. It is a policy of loyal submission to the colonial authorities. For in spite of cooperation the seed of political development of Indonesia is only determined by the ruler and is never the result of negotiations between both groups. In the July issue of *Indonesia Merdeka*, we find a striking description of the character of the cooperation policy, which we will repeat here:

'The policy of cooperation does not encourage self-confidence, but only confusion and a feeling of impotence in the subjugated people. It resigns people to what should be eternally unbearable. The enormous energy that is hidden in the masses is led along futile paths, which do not endanger the ruler's position. Compromises are made, which do not entail mutual concessions but amount to the ruler enforcing his will in a way that appears to be less brutal to the oppressed'.

Mr. Van der Zee has rightly said that 'political action is doing business for the community'.

But there is a fundamental difference between 'doing business for the community' and 'serving on the General Council'.

If Mr. Van der Zee assumes that participation in the General Council signifies a 'political education', he is thoroughly mistaken. If we leave the foreign elements and the mercenaries from the colonial capital out of consideration, then there is only a small group of Indonesian intellectuals who have political interests and have no connection with the mass movements that profits by this Council, while the masses remain just as unprivileged. Political training for the masses can only exist when they learn to look after their own interests, when they can create their own parliament, in which they can express their voice. Initially this representation could consist of national assemblies and national congresses.

Those who are familiar with the character of the colonial situation know that the ruler will not be willing to cooperate voluntarily in the liberation of Indonesia.

Every step in the direction of ultimate freedom must be extorted.

It is obvious that this can only be done by a power explosion of the masses and not by the verbosity of people in the General Council. The acquisition of power is of primary importance, the campaign for a General Council – even though it is not damaging to the development of the mass movement – is of minor importance.

We have seen how non-cooperation can arouse self-confidence in the masses and incite them to independent action.

It is sad for Mr. Van der Zee that it is the largest parties of the Indonesian federation, the P.N.I. and the P.S.I.I., that persist in non-cooperation, but we will have to accept the fact that it is only political non-cooperation that appeals to the Indonesian masses.

We do not mean to discuss Mr. Van der Zee's treatise in detail. We set ourselves the task, using his treatise as an example, of giv-

ing a brief outline of the intrinsic power of non-cooperation and the harmfulness of the policy of cooperation. We feel we have now accomplished this task.

First published in *De Socialist*, Vol. 2, no. 96, Fri. 1st Aug. 1930, and *De Socialist*, Vol. 2, no. 97, Fri. 8th Aug. 1930.

17 The Second International and the oppressed peoples

'About but without them'

Now that the demand of the oppressed peoples for immediate independence has become urgent, the Second International (S.A.I.) has had to take a clear stand on this issue.

At their latest congress in August of this year in Brussels their conclusion was laid down in a colonial resolution which did not turn out very well.

This colonial resolution divides the oppressed people into *four* categories. The *first* category contains those countries that are ready for *independence*: *China*, *Egypt*, *Iraq* and *Syria*. The *second* group of countries the Second International is willing to award *self-determination*, which according to its ideology is not the same as independence. To this lucky category belong *India*, the *Philippines*, *Korea* and *Annam*. The *third* group of colonies of which *Indonesia*, *Ceylon*, *Madagascar*, *Tunisia* and *Morocco* are part, have to be content with, as they put it, 'the extent of self-government which the population itself demands'. The *fourth* group are the 'colonies with primitive cultures', to which tropical and subtropical Africa and the areas in the Pacific ocean beyond belong. For these people foreign domination will remain intact. However, the resolution mentioned some measures which should serve to protect the native population from unlimited exploitation and oppression. The system of mandate of the League of Nations is strongly recommended for these countries.

Everybody who is familiar with the state of affairs in colonial countries would be astonished at the very *arbitrary* way in which the Second International classifies the oppressed people in categories.

If we leave China and Egypt out of consideration for the moment, because they are already independent countries in terms of international law, then there is the obvious question, why do they demand *absolute independence* for *Iraq* and *Syria* and not for

instance, *India*, the *Philippines*, *Annam*, *Korea* and *Indonesia*? Neither culturally nor in development are those countries second to the countries belonging to the first group.

And also why is Indonesia not regarded as equal to the countries of the second category? On paper the colonial resolution says, that Indonesia can get 'the extent of self-government that the population itself demands'. How this statement can be reconciled with Indonesia's cogent demands for immediate independence does not interest the Second International.

When the Second International has to accept as a fact, that countries with a lower level of development such as Liberia, Abyssinia, Hedjaz, Yemen, Siam etc. *can* be independent, how can they maintain that countries with a higher level of development such as India, the Philippines, Indonesia, and the others are not ready for independence? These are questions that the Second International was painfully trying to avoid!

The whole resolution is at variance with the principle of *national self-determination*, of which the Second International itself spoke so highly at its London Congress of 1896.

It is not surprising that the resolution called forth a sharp protest from the representatives of the oppressed peoples who were present in Brussels. Before the resolution was accepted, they sent a protesting telegram to the secretary of the S.A.I. that ran as follows:
'After having examined the resolution of the colonial committee of the S.A.I. we have come to the conclusion that the resolution, in the way in which it is expressed, is contrary to the *socialist* principle of self-determination and of equality for all nations and that the principle of self-determination and equality should be applied to all oppressed peoples and races without exception'.

This protest telegram is signed by Arthur Cipriani (Trade Union Trinidad), D. Chaman Lall (Indian Trade Union Leader), Geo E. de Silva (Trade Union Ceylon) and Abdul-Majdid Djojoadhiningrat (Perhimpoenan Indonesia). It was accompanied by an expression of sympathy from the Syrian delegation, namely Emir Chekib Arslan, Mohammed Ismail Tabbakh and Najik Armanazi, with the following contents:
'Basing ourselves on the principle of justice, of equality of nations and their right of self-determination, we are of the opinion that the signatories who represent large nations, ought to be listened to'.

The curious thing is that even the representatives of a country for which the Second International has demanded absolute inde-

pendence opposed this colonial resolution. The gentlemen of the Second International did not deign to take any notice of this.

The colonial resolution of the S.A.I. cannot but result in the continuation of the imperialistic policy. It is of great importance to establish here that it is precisely for *exploitation* colonies such as India, Indonesia and others, which annually yield hundreds of millions in gold to the respective mother countries, that it will not propose independence, but that it *will* do so for *Iraq* and *Syria*, which largely consist of sandy deserts and do not yield much material profit to the mandatories!

This line of action shows a striking resemblance to the capitalist colonial conception of the League of Nations. Article 22 of the Statutes of the League of Nations has made provision for the independence of Iraq and Syria, whereas with regard to the *fertile* exploitation colonies there is not a single mention of this eventuality. At the end of its resolution the S.A.I. urged the affiliated organisations to commit themselves to the freedom movement of oppressed nations in order to encourage them in their fight 'for the *principles expressed in this resolution*'. (!)

Do they suppose that the oppressed people give up their demand for immediate independence because this does not occur in the 'principles expressed'? The gentlemen of the Second International in Brussels took for granted that it was their right to decide upon the fate of oppressed peoples without consulting them. With this resolution the Second International has alienated itself even more from the oppressed peoples. Its dream of having a large number of supporters among them is likely to remain, as up to the present, a Utopia! If the socialist parties succeed in getting the 'colonial inheritance', then they will immediately find the oppressed peoples against them.

For a colonised nation will wage war against *any* colonial imperialism, whether it is called capitalist or socialist!

First published in *De Socialist*, specimen copy, 15 Sept. 1928.

18 The colonial resolution of the Second International

The Second International held a Congress in Brussels in the month of August of this year which was partly devoted to a discussion of the colonial problem. The result was recorded in a resolution, which contains the principles of the socialist colonial policy, to the discussion of which the following pages are devoted. For a good understanding of these matters it is important to introduce this discussion with a short account of the development of the National movements of the oppressed countries. For it is by the demands of the oppressed peoples that the colonial resolution of the Second International must be tested!

After the great war the colonial situation had become a burning problem. The main symptoms are the racial conflict and conflict of interest. The factors which have led to the aggravation of the confrontation between ruler and ruled are legion. The mere fact that in most cases the colonial situation consists of the domination of peoples of the coloured races by people of the white race is sufficient to bring the racial conflict into being. The colonial situation is always felt as a humiliation by the ruled, even if the ruled were to renounce the exploitation principle and even if he were to treat the colony as an equal part of the mother country. Unlike a colony[1] whose colonial population is of the same race as of the ruler's here the oppressed people want to break away completely from the mother country. It is not in the least in their interests for the political link with the mother country to be maintained.[2]

As soon as the subject of national independence is mentioned one touches on the racial problem. For a colony's aspiration to absolute independence is difficult to reconcile with the colonial ideas of the mother country. The wealth of a ruling country depends to a great extent on its colonial possessions and it is not inclined to give up such a useful possession without further ado. Hence the clash of interest between ruler and subject which in time develops into a

clash between races. The first World War has only accelerated this!

Until the beginning of this century one accepted as a basic principle that the superiority of the white race was unchallengeable. Because of its great advantage in the field of technology and because of the power of its weapons Western imperialism was full of its own perfection. However, Japan's conquest of the Russian colossus in 1905 brought about a change in this complacency. This historic event stimulated a nationalistic reveille in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. No sooner had this emancipation movement started than a fatal event in 1914 contributed much to sweeping away any prestige of the white race that still remained. Small wonder that especially during the war years the claim to national independence was formulated in an ever sharper manner. Under the pressure of the difficulties during the war and also because of the spectre of revolution that reared its head all over the world ever since the overthrow of the Tzarist regime in Russia, the colonial powers found themselves obliged to make all sorts of promises to their coloured subjects. They were given the prospect of a new constitution in order to buy their loyalty in these difficult times. The November promises have become an historical example in this respect! The faith that the colonial people had in them was kept alive by the Wilsonian gospel of self-determination.

But what a disenchanting effect did real politics have on the childlike faith of the oppressed nations! The result of India's loyalty, the reward for sacrificing thousands of her sons in the defence of Great Britain's honour was the proclamation of the infamous Rowlett Bills which kept that country under a military dictatorship although the War was over. When the Indian nationalists protested against this at a large meeting of more than 6000 people at Amritsar, General Dyer replied by having 1850 bullets fired at this defenceless crowd. And this case was not unique; apart from the bloody drama at Amritsar the oppressed nations suffered Dyer-like treatment in Egypt and Iraq and in the Garoer affair in Indonesia. Then they were surprised by the new colonial divisions and by new systems of colonial exploitation. Semi-colonial countries like Afghanistan and Persia also had to defend themselves against attempts by England at new predatory expeditions. Western imperialism in its own way tried to discharge its November promises by increasing its expansion drive, by more intensive exploitation of the colonised nations and in consequence by introducing the most reactionary colonial policies.

However paradoxical it may seem, it is true to say that Western imperialism became more formidable and dangerous to the oppressed nations just after the first World War, after it had been exhausted by its war efforts. This phenomenon is quite understandable, however. Europe not only lost millions of young lives which could have been extremely useful to the economy but it also lost enormous quantities of raw materials and semi-manufactured articles and millions of pounds worth of goods had been sacrificed at the altar of egoism and greed. Economically weakened Europe sought to protect itself from utter decline and downfall by a bolder application of imperialist politics and by increasing its colonial exploitation. There was less chance than ever before that it would release its colonies voluntarily. The colonial powers believe that the welfare of their population is best served by hanging on to their exploitation colonies. But at he same time one can observe how, owing to the deceitful imperialistic methods, the nationalistic claims of the oppressed people are proclaimed with ever greater emphasis. Now we can see the colonial conflict as it really is! A clash between two irreconcilable interests which is all the more aggravated by the racial differences between ruler and subject. It seems that the final solution of this problem lies in a drama of nations, the extent and intensity of which are difficult to foresee at the present time.

Anyway, our Century provides enough proof that the oppressed people of the coloured races are becoming more politically aware and are getting ready for their ultimate national liberation. They are realising everywhere that imperialism can only be successfully fought by a strong organisation. Not only nationally, but also internationally the utmost is done to build a united front. As soon as the awareness of the necessity of a united front on a wider basis has penetrated, the time will be ripe for the foundation of an International of oppressed peoples. It is the advance posts of the freedom movements in the West which have had the first taste of these international plans for unity. 'Perhimpoenan Indonesia' for instance, the representative of the Indonesian freedom movement in Europe has worked with great fervour to this end since 1924. Many factors have become points of contact for those who want to achieve their goal with united efforts. All those larger and smaller contacts will all be united in a great world organisation: the League against Imperialism, against Colonial Oppression and for National Independence. On the 15th February 1927 the world was surprised by this event that would find its place in world history. Although part

of the League consisted of the progressive part of the Western working class and of the left-wing of the Western bourgeois pacifist movement, it is chiefly the International of Oppressed people of the coloured races. The resolution that the League accepted last year in Brussels contains demands for immediate and absolute independence for all oppressed people, without exceptions of race and colour.

Those things could not pass by the Second International without being noticed. After all the commotion about the colonial problem the Second International was obliged to pay more attention to the matter of freedom for oppressed peoples. It is true, the Second International also occupied itself with the colonial matter before the war, namely during its congress at Stuttgart in 1907. But its involvement with the freedom movement of depressed peoples only consisted of a platonic declaration of sympathy and of cautious speeches. One could hardly say it had given any active support to the struggle for independence of the oppressed peoples of the coloured races. The colonial policy of the Second International of before the war did not go much further than the demand for an ethical and humane treatment of colonial subjects.

After the war the Second International was put in an awkward position because of some burning problems arising. The socialist parties of the European continent have in the meanwhile become a power factor which the ruling parties have to take into consideration. They are concerned with two more or less connected problems, though with opposed tendencies, namely the matter of participation in a coalition government with the bourgeois parties and the phenomenon of the growing force of the demand for national independence of the oppressed peoples. In between these problems is the question, what attitude they have to take towards the oppressed peoples, once they come into power. If one is familiar with politics, one would understand, why the socialist parties in countries with colonies, cannot and will not propose the radical abolition of colonial systems. For the consequence of this could only be that eager desire for participation in the government would become illusory. Further on we shall find another reason for their attitude.

At its Congress at Marseille the Second International cursorily touched on the colonial problem. The discussion of the colonial question was adjourned to 1928. The Congress appointed a colonial committee, on which there were representatives of England, Holland, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Austria and Russia. In the

meanwhile England and Holland produced a report, from which a communal resolution was finally produced.

According to *Het Volk* of 13th June, this resolution of the colonial committee partly contains tenets of Vliegen, complemented with special wishes of the Austrian socialist Bauer. On the basis of this draft resolution the colonial question was discussed at the latest congress in Brussels, and for the most part in closed session.

And now we come to the colonial resolution itself which was unanimously carried in Brussels!

This resolution starts with an introduction, in which the colonial policy is described as one of the means of expansion of capitalism over the entire world. This capitalist expansion is coupled with brutal oppression and shameless exploitation of the native population and with the plundering of their natural treasures. On the other hand it introduces modern production methods and modern social and cultural methods into the colonies. In this process of development the various colonial peoples have achieved different stages. Nations with a long history of civilisation have to a large extent made up arrears in the technical and social field under foreign domination. In these areas foreign domination can be withdrawn, 'without as a consequence a colony falling back from a certain stage in their capitalist development into an older and more primitive stage, . . . and without its being excluded from international trade'. On the other hand there are the colonial peoples in a primitive stage of development without a national democracy, which would fall back into primitive barbarism without the foreign white domination. Between those two extremes there are various colonial peoples on different planes of civilisation.

The colonial policy of the Second International would have to be adapted to these different stages of development. For this purpose the colonies are divided into three or rather four categories. The socialist colonial resolution distinguishes in the first place countries which are ready for independence and countries to whom they are willing to give the right of self-determination. Thus the S.A.I.[3] demands absolute independence for China, Egypt, Syria and Iraq. The right of self-determination is demanded for India, the Philippines, Korea and Annam.

And then as the third category we have 'colonies with a developed culture', to which the English crown colonies belong (with the exception of African and colonial areas in the Pacific), the French, Italian and Spanish colonies in North America, and then Indonesia

– in the terminology of the Second International this is naturally called 'Dutch Indies', – Madagascar, etc. For this category of colonies the S.A.I. demands the extent of self-government which the native population of these areas desires.

The socialist parties in countries that have colonies or mandates, will have to take measures to ensure the free exercise of self-government by the native population. Some measures to encourage self-government are mentioned here:

a. Representation of the people chosen for the whole of the population, without the consent of whom no new taxes could be introduced and no natural treasures could be given to capitalist enterprises;
b. municipal and provincial councils to be handed over to the native people with legal security for non-native minorities;
c. no legal privileges for foreigners;
d. all administrative and legal positions, including the highest, must be accessible to the natives.

The fourth category is described as colonies with 'a low cultural development' to which areas in tropical and sub-tropical Africa and in the Pacific Ocean belong. The different capitalist exploitation systems are elaborately enumerated here. And no less elaborately does the colonial resolution provide measures, which serve to protect the natives against unlimited exploitation and oppression. And finally the system of mandate is strongly recommended for the capitalist dominion of these colonies, on the condition, that the mandate committee of the League of Nations would be given a wider scope for supervision.

So here we have a 'fine' socialist colonial *Stufentheorie*, which for the *kolonialfremde* reader may have some attraction. But in reality this is more show than truth. Those who are familiar with the affairs in the different colonial countries, will be astonished at the extreme arbitrariness with which the S.A.I. classifies colonies into different categories. Why do they demand absolute independence for Iraq and Syria while India, the Philippines, Annam, Korea only get the right of self-determination which, according to the socialist ideology of the Second International, is not the same as independence, and to Indonesia, Ceylon and others only a lower kind of self-government may be awarded? Why are Annam and Korea considered on a higher plane than Indonesia? In spite of the enormous struggle of the Indonesian people for its liberation from

the Dutch imperialist yoke – together with more than seventy revolts in the last hundred years, the Second International still does not consider Indonesia equal to India, the Philippines, Korea and Annam, for whom they demand the right of self-determination. To quote, S.A.I. wanted to give Indonesia 'the extent of self-government that the native population itself demands'. How can they reconcile that with the fact that Indonesia has demanded its complete independence since 1913 which briefly and concisely means: Indonesia free from Holland? There is not a single party of importance in Indonesia that does not take the view, that Indonesia must immediately be free. Even the 'right' Boedi Oetomo does not think otherwise, as is obvious from its latest manifesto in comparison with the opening speech of the Governor General in the Peoples Council.

What is being said here about Indonesia applies just as much to the other countries who get less attention from the S.A.I. Neither Korea, India, the Philippines, Annam, Morocco nor N. Africa and others have ever declared anything other than that they would sooner see the foreign ruler leave today than tomorrow.

Nowhere in the whole Colonial resolution of the S.A.I. can we find legal grounds for this arbitrary division of the Colonial peoples into different categories. Nowhere do they try to give an explanation as to why one group of colonies is considered ripe for Independence and another group is not. If this socialistic division of the Colonial countries is both logically and empirically untenable, no less hypocritical is the idea of measuring the maturity of a country for Independence by a biased European standard of external refinement and so-called cultural development. The coloured peoples on our globe show indeed a variety of democratic and cultural development. As culture and democracy have to be a measure for maturity and independence, how is it to be explained that countries of a lower level of development such as Liberia, Abyssinia, Hedjaz, Yemen etc., are independent states, while people with a higher level of development and civilisation such as India, the Philippines etc., are still bowed under the powerful grip of Western Imperialism, in a phrase 'are not yet liberated'. When the first category of countries can be liberated why cannot the last group of countries be the same? These are questions which the Second International have carefully avoided.

Even if one eliminates these things and one sticks to the existing facts, that developed peoples of the coloured race are oppressed,

then one looks in vain for a motive why immediate Independence was claimed for Iraq and Syria but not for other countries with equal or more development. If one takes cultural and intellectual development as a measure of comparison, then it is hypocritical to consider India, the Philippines etc. as backward compared to Iraq and Syria. The normal development of the Syrians and the inhabitants of Iraq was obstructed for decades because of shameful neglect by their former Turkish rulers. If one goes by national democracy even then it is inexplicable why Indonesia, the Philippines and others have to come after Iraq and Syria. However one looks at the matter, it is impossible for the Second International to give an acceptable explanation based on the principle of equal rights for the Nations. The question is now justified as to why the S.A.I. does not demand the immediate independence of all suppressed Nations in principle!

This whole socialist Colonial system goes against the principle of the national right of self-determination which by the Second International itself was praised so highly at a congress in London in 1896. What right has the S.A.I. to perpetuate the Colonial system for the most oppressed nations? When Socialism rejects the exploitation of man by man, why does the Second International exalt as a system the continuation of the exploitation of people by people in regard to the most colonised nations?

It is true that the S.A.I. requires certain standards for the protection of the colonised people against limitless exploitation by the Capitalists. But all this is nonsense, it is nothing more than a senseless phrase. Because it cannot carry through that demand, and imperialism will not put an end to Colonial exploitation. It cannot do it because it does not have the power for that purpose; Colonial imperialism does not want it, because the colony only has any significance when it can be exploited. It naturally has no use for a colony when this colony as a result of different political, economic and social demands which have to be satisfied, does not produce profits. The so called 'mission sacrée' of colonisation is misleading and deceptive and does not at all fit the framework of the present capitalistic order. Nowhere is colonisation begun in the service of philantrophy to fulfil the desires for education of the less civilised nations. The purpose has always been and will be the intensive exploitation of the national resources of the subjugated land for the need of the Motherland. That exploitation always goes hand in hand with the suppression of the native population and use of its labour

force. When now the S.A.I. with regard to most Colonial nations wishes to continue the alien white rule, this has no other meaning than the continuation of Colonial imperialism, of colonial oppression.

Anyone who studies the Colonial resolution of the Second International will undoubtedly be affected by its remarkable parallel with the capitalistic Colonial conception. We are considering here mainly article 22 of the Peoples Pact, which establishes a new kind of colonies: the so-called mandate system for which the S.A.I. seems to have a great preference. This system incorporated the former German and Turkish Colonies. Depending on their level of development these countries were divided into mandatory states A, B, and C. Iraq, Syria and Palestine belong to mandatory states A. The last-named is simply ignored in the Colonial resolution of the Second International. These countries, according to the Peoples Union Pact, have reached such a level of development that their existence as independent nations can be recognised provisionally. Where they, under the difficult circumstances of modern life, in the opinion of the Peoples Union, are not yet able to exist independently, they will receive a mandate to help them with their administration, until they are able to govern themselves. The principle is recognised here that Iraq, Syria and Palestine have the right to complete independence.

It is remarkable to find that there is room in the conception of the Peoples Union Pact for the education of Iraq, Syria and Palestine to independence. But there is not one single word about the same possibilities with reference to the exploitation colonies such as India, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Annam etc. For him who can see through the capitalist colonial ideology, this situation is very understandable! The possession of Iraq and Syria, which consist mainly of desert, does not produce much profit for Western Imperialism. Their possession is only of value from the strategic point of view. But at the moment of the drawing up of the Peoples Union Pact that strategic meaning was not of so much importance as was the case when the mighty central powers and their Osman Appendix still existed. Western Imperialism has no need for the long-standing posession of these countries, which yield them almost nothing economically. That is why they were declared independent so willingly. It is different with the possession of exploitation colonies such as India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Annam etc. These countries bring in hundreds of millions in gold for the

Motherland. The wealth of the ruling nation depends for a large part on the possession of these countries. As long as that annual stream of millions continues, the rulers will not be inclined to give these exploitation colonies back their independence.

It is remarkable, but at the same time of great importance, how the division by the S.A.I. of the colonies links up with the capitalistic conception; how its demand for colonial independence on one side and colonial self-government on the other practically coincides with the grouping of mandate countries A on one side and of exploitation colonies on the other.

With the establishment of this fact we come to the fundamental question, how serious is the Second International about the freedom of the oppressed peoples in exploitation colonies. The willingness of the socialist parties in the countries which own colonies, to give these their Independence, is being doubted by the representatives of the colonised people concerned, and even by prominent socialists. Doubted at least while our society is still under Capitalist rule. It is understandable that the socialist rulers in the colonised countries are not inclined to agree, when one judges the situation by the relative prosperity of the working-class in the Motherland at the moment. If Indonesia tore itself loose from Holland, then the working-class would find itself in the situation of having its income reduced by three-quarters. Possibly this could mean more unemployment and longer working hours. In his brochure 'Zonder tropen geen Europa', Vleming, who can measure his conservatism with Vliegen, is honest enough to say:

'The Dutch people, its stunning – I would almost say frightening – increase, the economic relations of the Netherlands with the Colonies have grown out of shape in such a manner, that the ties between the Netherlands and the Indies cannot be roughly broken. It is of enormous importance for the general wellbeing of the seven million-plus population of our small country – they are there after all and we have to accept the fact – that every year a considerable export balance, and this means the Indies exports a much greater value than it imports ... should flow to the Netherlands!'

Seen from the selfish racial standpoint, it is quite understandable that the Dutch socialist leaders do not want to know anything about early Independence for Indonesia!

But on the other hand the truth has to be established that the Dutch working-class owes 'its privileged position, practically unique in the whole of Europe', its relative prosperity to the indirect ex-

ploitation of the Indonesian people. Indirect, via the Dutch Colonial Capitalists, who took away enormous profits from Indonesia, gained by exploitation of underpaid labour of the Indonesians. In how far this existing fact is morally compatible with socialism, is a matter which the supporters of this theory have to decide for themselves. Likewise it lies beyond the scope of the writer's competence to judge, whether in the long run it will be an advantage for socialism. It can be stated as a fact that a small minority of Dutch socialists oppose the present situation. From the opposition camp one hears it strongly proclaimed that it is unsocialist for the Dutch working class to live at the expense of its Indonesian opposite numbers and that this fact in itself is bad for the future of socialism.

What is being said here about Holland also applies to Great Britain if India suddenly became independent. The British Labour Party must be called honest to the extent that it openly says that it is willing to give India 'Home Rule', but only within the British Empire. That is why the following statement has been made in its programme: 'It is the policy of the Labour Party to take relationships between Great Britain . . . and the other communities of the British Commonwealth of Nations'.

If one understands the true position of the S.A.I. as regards the question of Independence of the oppressed peoples of coloured race, then it is immediately explained why it uses the concept 'the Nations' right of self-determination', in its Colonial resolution as vaguely as possible and in an ambiguous way! In conclusion the Second International mentions the following:

'The S.A.I. calls for the affiliated parties to contact the freedom movements of the oppressed peoples, to support them in their fight for the principles and demands expressed in this resolution, especially to promote the developments of the policy and Trade Union movement of the workers in these countries, and to influence them in the sense of democracy and Socialism.'

Thus the Socialist Parties have to support the fight of the oppressed coloured peoples, but . . . that fight has to stay within the framework of the foundations laid down by the S.A.I. The majority of oppressed peoples must renounce their demands for immediate independence, if they wish to be assured of the S.A.I.'s support.

The tragedy of this resolution is, that its planners themselves are unable to see that the Second International precisely by its Colonial resolution, renders the cooperation with the oppressed peoples required by it illusory. The S.A.I. has its own attitude to blame for the

fact that its influence in the Colonised countries hitherto amounts to practically nothing. Also its future dream of developing strong support among the oppressed people will remain a Utopia! The S.A.I. aims to place the freedom movement under its leadership. But the oppressed peoples are only willing to work together with European organisations on the basis of their national requirements and on an equal footing. They reject any foreign leadership of whatever nature this may be.

First published in *De Vlam*, 1st October, 1928.

1. Such as the English dominions, Canada, Australia, South Africa.
2. The colonial policy distinguishes between two kinds of colonies. In the one the colonial population is of the same race as the ruling people. The other is caused by emigration of white people to an inhabited or scantily populated area in another part of the world than Europe. Here the blood relationship plays a part in the relationship between mother country and colony. There is hardly ever any talk about the colony breaking away from the mother country. It is quite a different case with an exploitation colony, also sometimes called 'native' colony, which is inhabited by a people of another race, usually autochthons. The rulers have acquired these colonies by subjection of the native people, led to it by a need for economic expansion, i.e. from imperialistic motives.
3. The S.A.I. pretends also to support the freedom fight in countries that are apparently, or at least according to International law, independent, but basically dependent on others because of the system of military invention, unequal treaties of the imperialistic powers.

19 Indonesia's demand for immediate independence

In answer to my discussion of the colonial resolution of the Second International in the specimen copy of *De Socialist*, *Het Volk* of 14th September last writes in the article 'Indonesian Nationalism' the following two sentences:

'When Mohammad Hatta, one of the four acquitted Indonesian students, in the specimen copy of the weekly paper *De Socialist*, opposing the colonial motion of our Brussels Congress claiming for Indonesia "that measure of self-government the population itself desires", about "Indonesia's urgent claim for immediate independence", he substitutes his own wish for reality. Those requiring the immediate independence of Indonesia, i.e., those who are actively nationalist, still constitute a small group, which cannot be equated with "Indonesia" at all.'

These two sentences are for *Het Volk* sufficient to make those readers that are not familiar with the subject believe that the idea of immediate independence is strange to the Indonesian people. Then one can maintain for the same readers that the system *declaring Indonesia immature, because of its enormous natural resources as laid down beforehand*, is justified.

However, is this all *Het Volk* has to say about the question of principle I raised in my discussion? Is this the answer to my positive question: why countries like *Liberia*, *Abyssinia*, *Hedjaz*, *Yemen* and others can be independent, whereas countries with a higher level of development such as *India*, the *Philippines*, *Indonesia*, etc. cannot? Is this an explanation of why *Indonesia* in the socialistic colonial conception is inferior, even to *Annam* and *Korea*? Further, does all this refute my analysis of the problem that the S.A.I. takes exactly the same line as the capitalist colonial conception, in which it *does* demand independence for the mandated countries of *Iraq* and *Syria*, which largely consist of sandy deserts and yield few resources, and

in which it does *not* so demand for the *exploited* colonies such as India, Indonesia etc., which yield hundreds of millions worth of gold a year to their respective 'home-countries'.

As the socialist conscience is involved in these questions they are passed over in silence. The majority of the *Het Volk* readers will not even notice! But this is really sad for an organisation professing to serve democracy and adhering to the doctrine of self-determination.

If *Het Volk*, on the strength of its *political intentions*, maintains that the demand for immediate independence is the wish of only a small group this demonstrates a total lack of orientation as regards the national tendencies in Indonesia. Apparently they are so uninformed about the Indonesian national movement, that they do not even know that this claim for independence, enunciated for the first time in 1913 by the then N.I.P., has been postulated for years by the big nationalist organisations like the P.K.I. and the Sarikat Rajat of the time, the present Partai Sarikat Islam and the now leading Partai Nasional Indonesia. Even the 'right-wing' Boedi Oekomo's strongest desire is that the oppressors pack their bags today rather than tomorrow.

One could undoubtedly assert, à la Colijn, that these organisations do not comprise the total Indonesian population of 50 million souls, babies included. But where on earth *do* the political organisations of a country comprise the whole population? The S.D.A.P. itself, representing about a fourth part of the Dutch people in the Second Chamber, only has a membership of some 50,000, which in itself is hardly enough to gain two seats there.

Het Volk certainly cannot deny that what is voiced by the national movement is representative of the whole nation, is the expression of popular consciousness. Does not *Het Volk* itself write as against Colijn, that 'any form of national awakening always starts with the creation of a national intellect that becomes more and more expression of the popular consciousness?'

Het Volk can easily imply to its readers that Indonesia has not yet arrived at that stage. We, on the other hand, observe the *fact* that national consciousness is not only represented by a small group of intellectuals but already by a large active mass in the organised movement.

The Indonesian parties would undoubtedly have many more members if absolute freedom of reunion existed throughout the

country and if there were fewer subclauses in the Indonesian Penal Code, hanging over the people's heads like a sword of Damocles.

The fact that so many thousands of people have still remained and become members of political organisations aiming at: 'Indonesia free from Holland' demonstrates the people's urge for liberty. If one, by way of experiment, held a plebiscite on the question: 'Indonesia free immediately, yes or no!', the outcome would be surprising and might even cause the editors of *Het Volk* to faint with terror.

Also among the unorganised groups of the population this urge for freedom has manifested itself several times in a different, more spontaneous way.

In the last century alone, several groups of the population from different parts of Indonesia tried to throw off the detested white yoke, in more than seventy revolts. Still Atjeh is not yet at rest. If this is not a sign of the urge for liberty, then *Het Volk* perhaps knows better?

A sober view of the problem of nationality, and some cognizance of what history teaches us, must already open our eyes to the psychological fact that there is no country in the world, however backward, which volutarily submits to foreign oppression without offering resistance. When an oppressed country temporarily acquiesces in a state of servitude then it is only because it cannot manage to break the superior power of the well-organised oppressor without self-destruction.

If Indonesia cannot yet be free it is not because the desire for immediate independence does not exist among the majority of the people, but because the Indonesian people do not yet have the power to force its oppressor to restore that freedom. If the moderate elements in the country are willing to cooperate with the oppressor, to take part in the people's council, it is not because they don't wish to have immediate independence, but because they do not see any possibility of expelling the Dutch Imperialists and achieving their freedom now.

Het Volk here confuses fact and norm in order to find grounds for the reactionary policy of the S.D.A.P. towards Indonesia. As a result of this policy the S.D.A.P. has forfeited for ever[1] the confidence of the Indonesian people which they tried to gain. It will be to their own shame and cost!

For the Indonesian national movement, which pursues a policy of relying on its own powers and capacities, it does not make any difference whether the colonial resolution of the Second International exists or not.

The problem of freedom is not one of being mature or immature, where independence is concerned; it is a question of power!

First published in *De Socialist*, no. 1, Saturday, 6th October 1928.

1. We hope not *for ever.* Our Indonesian friends must not forget that the majority of S.D.A.P. members have not yet found the opportunity to give their opinions about these matters. Until then *we refuse* to accept that the viewpoint held by the editors of *Het Volk* is that of the whole Party. (Editors of *De Socialist*).

20 The Digoel tragedy of Dutch colonial imperialism

The appointment of the Freedom Unionist Mr D. Fock as Governor-General of Indonesia marked the prologue to the Digoel tragedy. The time of legalised violence, in which the Indonesian people were even more at the mercy of the despotic arbitrariness of a sensual tyrant, that iron man, who, they say, did not shrink from fiddling tens of millions to make the State budget balance, the time of the colonial reign of terror founded on crazy opportunism and power had dawned. The people's interests were whittled away in the most rigorous manner, as this man 'with the straight face and iron fist' did not have the courage to tax big business which was operating and draining the country to any significant degree, which undoubtedly was the most obvious solution to supply the most urgent financial needs. The national debt, which threatened to bankrupt the Indonesian Government, was laid with all its weight on the shoulders of the severely impoverished population. Could it have been otherwise? The fact that Mr Fock is one of the leaders of the capitalist party in Holland, the Vrijheidsbond, explains everything.

It is a common social phenomenon that in an economic collapse of national prosperity of this kind – as the Heunder/Meijer Ranneft report has so clearly shown – consolidation of the revolutionary idea is created. But the ruler, conscious of his great power, requites the discontent which he himself has cultivated with brute force. The constantly increasing varieties of repressive means are wielded with inexorable severity.

But the fire of resistance could no longer be extinguished the spirit of revolution flared up all over the archipelago. The ill-chosen precautionary measures of the foolish Government to check the constantly growing and spreading conflagration of discontent mock at all the laws of nature. The prohibition of assemblies, the suppression of the people's right to strike, the arbitrary internment of popular leaders, carried out in a nervous excitement one after the

other, only succeeded in maintaining superficial calm in the country, but the revolutionary spirit was not to be curbed by force.

And when the tyrant Fock bade farewell to be Buitenzorg throne, to make way for his well-intentioned, but constantly tacking ethical successor, he had already piled up the wood for the fire of revolt which was soon to set the country, or at any rate some parts of it, ablaze.

The people were only waiting for the right moment to convert their grievances into actions. Thus the uprisings in West Java and the West Coast of Sumatra in the years 1926 and 1927 could have been foreseen, as the very last means for the people to defend their rights. The Colonial Government feels itself offended in its 'supreme' and 'divine' rights by such 'unlawful crimes'. When the rebellious 'villains' had been slaughtered by the valiant Jan Kompenie's cold steel, now dripping with innocent blood, when Dutch militarism had once again had the 'festive' opportunity to show its 'heroic deeds beyond praise' to the terrified and astonished world, when the colonial capitalist gentlemen had recovered somewhat from their fright, the ethical Governor went out on a manhunt with his pack of trained bloodhounds. Communists, semi- and pseudo-communists, revolutionaries, even innocent suspects were in for it.

In order to facilitate the noble work, the Government has the right, founded on nothing but its own arbitrariness, to decree banishment. There is no easier way to put its political adversaries subtly out of the way and even to exterminate them. With an enviable elegance, accompanied by inhuman unscrupulousness, it puts the exorbitant rights, as laid down in articles 35, 36, 37 and 38 of the I.P.C. to right royal good use.

We shall not speak here of the legal character of the measures which find their application in the system of colonial domination and which has never found justification in the Indonesian people's consciousness. It is completely clear that the exorbitant rights 'are a means to achieve absolute obedience and respect towards the Government and to preserve peace and quiet'.

Even such laws as this are not sufficiently unjust for the ruler. Moreover, these exorbitant rights are applied in a most unlawful way. The colonial oppressor is not ashamed to violate his own rules. A characteristic symptom of the degeneration of Holland's imperialism! Quite contrary to the spirit and the letter of the law, which mentions a definite place, suspects are dumped in a spot hastily cleared in the impenetrable forests of New Guinea, in the midst of pools and marshes.[1]

When the star correspondent of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant,* Dr. Van Blankenstein himself, spoke of this 'habitable' place, to which exiles are sent, he said that the camp threatens to become a failure from the economic and health point of view, and that malaria and blackwater fever will in time wipe out the colony. 'The penal colony of Cayenne contrasts favourably with this hellish pond', he declared. Dr. Nielsen wrote almost the same thing in *Het Haagse Maandblad* and in the *Frankfurter Zeitung.*

In spite of the repeated statements by the Government to the effect that the hygiene conditions in Upper Digoel are satisfactory – could it be otherwise, when the investigation was carried out by a committee consisting exclusively of civil servants and police officers? – information to the contrary is constantly reaching us from Digoel itself, published in the Indonesian papers, which makes us doubt the truth of the official statements.

In *Persatoean Indonesia,* for example, we read the following extract from a letter written by an exile:

'Death grins at us continuously. Digoel is no longer a place. It has become a heap of consumptives and malaria sufferers, neurotics and semi-lunatics, under the scorching heat of the merciless tropical sun, surrounded by unhealthy marshes in the midst of dense impenetrable forests. The only visiting guests to our camp, if we leave out of account the uninvited vermin and disease germs, are the savages, the uncivilised Kaya-Kaya's. Before, we used to get rice, now we only get *gabah,* which we have to pound ourselves. It is true that as a result of eating *gabah* the dreaded beri-beri disappears, but instead of this most people suffer from all kinds of skin diseases.'

In this article we will not expatiate on banishments of the second degree, which are just as unlawful as the mass internments in the first term. Everyone knows that this concerns persons who give evidence of strength of character, who despite the intolerable pain and misery will not relinquish their ideals and principles.

What will be the end of this Digoel tragedy? The Government thinks to suppress the revolutionary spirit with these mass deportations. By guarding the people against their intellectual 'agitators', the ruler imagines he can guarantee peace and order, but he forgets that only the freedom of the Indonesian people can remove the deeper reasons for the resistance. Each exiled leader is replaced by dozens. Each victim spurs people on to stronger action.

With proudly erect heads the condemned rebels mounted the Oppressor's scaffold. With admirable courage too the hundreds of

exiles, fighters and defenders of oppressed Indonesia go to face a slow but certain death in the living grave of Upper Digoel. These martyrs to the idea of freedom may fall as sacrifices to the despotic tyranny of the ruler, but *not* their children who went with them to the land of the doomed or who were born there. Surely the descendants of these revolutionary heroes do not belong among the exiles. In time the descendants who once witnessed the tribulations and tenacity of their parents, will return to society.

It should not surprise us if it is just these children who later on are the brave and zealous exponents of the revolutionary idea, undaunted fellow-conquerors of our freedom, of *Indonesia Merdeka.* He laughs best who laughs last, and one day the time will come when *we* shall be having the last laugh.

The Oppressor's supremacy in our Fatherland is swiftly coming to an end; every measure taken against us by the Colonial Government will only prove fatal to itself and hasten its own downfall. By applying its exorbitant rights the Government has only dug its own grave. With this weapon it exterminates a small group of its opponents, but in so doing it breeds a greater host of Indonesia freedom fighters more dangerous for it, who in their youth have been fed on the bitter bread of banishment. This is the irony of the Digoel adventure!

This Digoel tragedy is one of the comfortless scenes along the path of suffering for our people on their way to the sunlit future, where they will breathe a free air. The series of ordeals which leads the sorely tried Indonesian people to the gates of freedom is not yet over. Who can tell? . . . 'For the realization of this ideal lonely individuals have given their lives on the scaffolds; died in chains; have pined in exile, carrying ever in their hearts the vision of a blessed land. Their ordeal is one which only fellow-sufferers are allowed to understand. Their struggle is never applauded by the gallery, and the humble and nameless soldiers of the cause will ever die without reaching their goal. Theirs is a lonely fight and is called the Ordeal for Freedom.'

First published in *Indonesia Merdeka*, 1929.

1. The illegality of these mass internments is very well demonstrated by Dr. Van Vlissingen in the magazine *Recht en Vrijheid*, and also by Prof. Simon in the *Weekblad voor het Recht*. Our newspaper has written about it before in *Indonesia Merdeka*, no. 4-5, 1927.

21 Three years of the Digoel scandal

The W. P. Hillen Report

The lie

Already at the beginning of the Internments in Upper Digoel it was pointed out by several authoritative sources that this mass deportation was illegal, contradictory to the letter and spirit of the Indonesian Polity itself and clashing with every human feeling.

Nevertheless the Indies government maintained for a long time that its action was completely in order. As regards the place of exile, the Government tried to lead the public up the garden path by declaring that Upper Digoel was malaria-free, despite the fact that an eye-witness, the Danish journalist Dr. Aage K. Nielsen, had written the opposite. Without so much as a blush the then Minister of Colonies, Dr. Koningsberger, declared at a banquet of the 'Union Coloniale Française' in 1928 that 'the interior of New Guinea, where the culprits were sent with their families, is favourable for the creation of an agricultural colony'. He made a similar reassuring statement in answer to Mr Mendels' speech in which the latter protested against the Digoel escapade of the Indies authorities.

But a lie has no legs . . .!

In the course of time the widows of deceased internees returned to society and made some communications, albeit somewhat covertly, to the Press about the untenable situation in Upper Digoel. One of them said the following in an interview to the Chinese/Malay newspaper *Keng Po* (*cf.* the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* of the 11th July 1928):

'The first vegetables ever grown in Digoel were fine, but the second time everything was a complete failure. Even the *katjang* (beans) will not come up. Ricegrowing was a complete failure. Certainly the rice looked beautiful, but the ears were empty.'

And this area according to Dr. Koningsberger was 'favourable for the creation of an agricultural colony'. This is the way the

responsible politicians of the Netherlands talk about the conditions in their colony!

In the meantime the star correspondent of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, Dr. Van Blankenstein, visited Upper Digoel too and revealed sensational facts in the press, where the place was tersely referred to as *hell*. Yet the Indonesian Government tried to maintain that the situation was not black as described by Dr. Van Blankenstein.

However, in the long run it was of no avail to disguise the truth. Letters from exiles to their relatives, though subject to censorship, were able to get it over that 'Digoel has become a heap of consumptive and malaria sufferers, neurotics and semi-lunatics'. Even the continuous quinine cure was apparently unable to cope with the undermining and hellish climate of the place.

Eventually the escape of some of the exiles has focused attention on the misdeeds of the colonial government in Digoel.

The Hillen Report

Then at last, after so many lies and excuses, the Indonesian Government decided to send Mr. W. P. Hillen, a member of the Netherlands Indies Council, to Upper Digoel to make a study of the situation.

He returned to Java suffering from severe malarial fever, which proves irrefutably that Upper Digoel is a thoroughly unhealthy place.

His findings were embodied in a report, a part of which was recently published in the press, inter alia in *Het Volk* of the 28th August. Mr. Hillen found that innocent people had been exiled, and decided that to a large number of exiles their freedom of movement should be restored. How the banishment had been handled is evident from the following statement by Mr. Hillen:

'It need not occasion any surprise that in Tanah Merah I met various people who would never have been proposed for exile if there had been better judgment.'

Now, *more than three years later*, after the deaths of many innocent people in Upper Digoel, a member of the Government arrives at the startling conclusion that 'mistakes' have been made over the mass internments.

But Mr. Hillen would not be a true member of the Government if he did not manage to excuse these 'mistakes'. He made out, that

'it was not possible to give such detailed instructions about the standard of danger as to make the exact meaning quite clear'.

Now the faults are laid at the door of the regional leaders. For... 'the government could not do otherwise than place general confidence in the policy of the head of the regional authorities and the supervision exercised by the Public Prosecutor.'

No blame attaches to the advisers of the Government either, because 'they thought they were truly acting in accordance with the intentions of the Government'. Mistakes – so it went on – were inevitable if one had to act so hastily. Furthermore, a considerable number of internees repented. The internment was a salutary punishment for them'.

In this way they try to excuse an outrageous injustice and a great crime, that of driving people by the hundred deep into the wilderness.

Arbitrariness

In an earlier article on the 'exorbitant rights' in *De Socialist* no. 9 of the 1st December 1928, I explained clearly how arbitrarily the mass internments were carried out. Even a regulation in the organic law itself, viz. the Indonesian Polity, guaranteeing the self-defence of the persons in question, was outrageously violated because this suited the purposes of the Indonesian government.

For that matter, in the practice of internment the clause of Art. 38 of the I.P.C., to the effect that the 'Governor-General does not make a decision regarding the person concerned until after his defence has been heard or he has been summoned for that purpose' and that a report is to be made of the hearing, has never been observed. The person brought up for internment has to answer a number of questions, even though his internment is a foregone conclusion regardless of the answers given by him.

If this is already a flagrant breach of a legally guaranteed right, the manner in which the mass internments of 1927 were prepared flies in the face of it completely. The questions and the answers desired by the authority were cut and dried in advance, and the candidate for exile had only to put his signature to them. If he refused he was tortured and eventually forced to sign. As this was common knowledge, it could not be assumed by anyone that the 'high government' was not au fait with it.

Granting that the number of arrested and suspected 'dangerous' persons was large, there was still not the slightest justification for the great haste and unbounded arbitrariness with which the mass internments were carried out. A close investigation would even have been possible, apart from the injustice adhering to the banishment of people to Upper Digoel. The hundreds of arrested persons could not constitute a danger to 'peace and order' seeing that they were 'safely' under lock and key. A close investigation was even more necessary because they were innocent of rebellion. The real culprits had already been severely punished or hanged, of course, to the satisfaction of Holland's sense of justice.

Strong resistance imperative

No matter how one looks at the Digoel affair, one can only come to the conclusion that this mass deportation is a crime, inspired by vindictiveness, and the responsibility for which in the last instance rests on the Dutch people.

The Indies government permits itself to take 'corrective' action against any resistance by the Indonesian people, with the full force of its might and its judicature, even when the resistance is within the law. But there entirely lacks a power which can protect the people against misuse of power by the authority, whilst the right to moral resistance against arbitrary power is refused to them.

Dutch public opinion could throw up a dam against an extreme abuse of power in Indonesia. However, in a number of cases it has been apparent that the conscience of the Dutch people does not prick them for an injustice committed by their representatives in authority beyond the frontiers of Holland and for which they are ultimately responsible. Will that conscience still be dumb when Mr. Hillen comes out with such startling information about the mass internments in Upper Digoel?

If 'Christian' Holland continues to be silent and thus sanctions the crimes of its overseas representatives in its 'Christian' way, what will be the attitude of the Dutch working classes?

How will they wipe out their share of responsibility for the injustice perpetrated? Will there be a forceful resistance, a violent protest from their side?

Indonesia awaits their action!

First published in *De Socialist*, 2nd yr., no. 102, 12th September 1930.

22 Governor-General De Graeff and the Indonesian freedom movement

When Mr. de Graeff in the autumn of 1926 took over the position and dignity of Governor-General from Mr. Dirk Fock, at the public session of the General Council, he said that one of the most important points of the coming government policy would be regaining the confidence of the Indonesian people in the government. He did not fail to criticise as indirectly the iron-fist policy of his predecessor by saying, that the fight against communism should not degenerate into a systematic persecution. He also said he would not be a true Dutchman, if he had no respect for Indonesian nationalist ideals.

This probably appealed to those whose Indonesian nationalist heart is not in the right place. They forget that one must be careful with a diplomat, for he tends to pursue his objectives with gentle means which are not repellent to the opponent. About the principles of colonial policy and in particular the maintenance of Dutch authority in Indonesia, Fock and de Graeff certainly do not disagree. They only differ in opinion about the tactics that are to be used. Whereas Mr. Fock was of the opinion that Dutch authority had to be maintained against the growing freedom movement by ruling with an iron rod, by brutal violence, De Graeff thought he could achieve the same by an ethical policy of flattery which would pacify the revolutionary feelings of the Indonesians and lull to sleep the nationalist movement. Did not the gentleman-diplomat Count Van Limburg Stirum, successfully follow this political line of action while he was in power? But De Graeff forgot, that the circumstances in Indonesia are different from what they were some ten years ago.

Indonesia Merdeka (no. 4, 1926, p. 98), the newspaper of 'Perhimpoenan Indonesia' rightly remarked with reference to the appointment of Mr. De Graeff as governor-general:

'The white press in Holland and Indonesia has devoted a large number of articles to the introduction of this ethical flattery policy,

in which predictions are made as to the chances of Mr. Graeff. But this nervous manoeuvring will not be able to impede our material development which is moving at an ever-increasing rate.

The ruler who in his own naivety thinks that we are so childish as to allow ourselves to be flattered again by a sly diplomat with his ethical clap-trap and that we will be diverted even an inch from the road we have once embarked upon, will be disappointed! Time will tell!'

The development of the events of the last two years has confirmed the correctness of this prognosis. But that is understandable, because with the change of person in the position of governor-general the *system* itself remains untouched in its foundations. Whoever occupies this post, and whatever his personal political and social convictions may be, he *is* the responsible senior officer, whose task it is to maintain Dutch authority in Indonesia.

The deceptiveness of De Graeff's sweet words soon became evident, when he refused to grant the requests of Indonesian-national circles to cancel the notorious articles 153 bis and ter and also 161 bis of the Indies penal code, because they restrict the freedom of movement of Indonesian political organisations and trade unions. If De Graeff had been serious in his endeavour to regain the confidence of the Indonesian population, then he would have obviously cancelled these hated articles, which originated from Mr. Fock's reign of terror. Thus one already feels, what the real content is of the proclaimed policy of 'regaining confidence'. Later it will become evident that this policy does not imply anything but a hint expressed in flattering terms, to the Indonesian nationalists to submit to the leadership of the government and to 'cooperate' with it; and moreover not to give rein to their nationalist aspirations except within the bounds set by the government.

When in November 1926 and in January 1927 the populations of Bantam and Sumatra's West Coast rebelled against the authorities, as a result of misgovernment and of the economic and social misery – the government committee itself established later – then it was found that the 'ethical' hand of De Graeff could strike a heavier blow than the fist of a born tyrant such as Fock.

Never has government tyranny been so prevalent as when he was in power. Hundreds of people were exiled to the vast wilderness of New Guinea without any trial. It is part of his 'ethics', that he chooses one of the most unhealthy places in the Archipelago where malaria and blackwater fever are rampant, as the concentration

camp for his political opponents who, in spite of the fact that the Indonesian penal law is drawn up as flexibly as possible, cannot be prosecuted legally. That this mass banishment to the Upper Digoel is contrary to the intent of the legislator and thus is *illegal*, does not concern him. Never have the so-called 'exorbitant rights' – the right to banish people without any trial – been applied so frequently as at that time. The term exorbitant, which in this case means *extra-ordinary*, cannot really be applied here any more. For this misuse of power – which in the language of the rulers is also called rights – has become the practice!

The finest part of it was yet to come, when the Governor-General himself, at the opening of the General Council in 1927, declared that it was not impossible that there were some completely innocent people among the exiles. Something similar the star correspondent of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* expressed in his disclosure of the unbearable and inhuman situation in the Upper Digoel. A few months ago the Secretary of State for the Colonies himself announced in the Dutch parliament that 'conscientious' enquiries would be made to ascertain to what extent innocent people had been exiled to this region. The government does not show much impatience to start this enquiry. Moreover these statements suggest that the factor of 'guilt' is really involved in those banishments. The 'guilty' ones have long since been imprisoned or hanged. And for the very reason that those hundreds of people are in the sense of the law *not guilty* they are deported to the Upper Digoel, for which the contemptible excuse is given that they 'are a danger to public peace and quiet'. To what extent that was true, the colonial government in its nervousness had no time to investigate.

Dr. Van Blankenstein wrote after his visit to the Upper Digoel: 'The administration of Tanah Merah divides the intellectuals among the interned into two main groups: a large, rightwing group, and a small group of leftist irreconcilable intellectuals. The leftists have now been put in a new camp, separated from the rest by the whole of the military and administrative section of the main camp. There are for the time being about fourteen confirmed communists who have to pitch their extremely primitive living quarters under the grimmest circumstances in the *middle of pools and marshes.* It is, and nobody will dispute this, *a hell*, which I hope to describe in more detail later on. Even the supply of food was absolutely insufficient because it was so difficult to get to this place overland . . . When I arrived at the desolate camp where those fourteen men

lived in isolation, *I could have believed that I had come to one of those terrible convict settlements of the French deportation colony in Cayenne.* There I saw exiles in the same state of neglect. Via a creek we arrived by motor launch at the camp. We found there a small "pondok" covered by a *layer of zinc* but *without walls* which was meant as a sleeping place for fourteen people. Then there was a clearing where the trees had been cut down and where a frame had been built for bigger barracks. And that was the only area that would not be flooded by the high tide of the Digoel. There were pools of water everywhere. *Hygienically it was a hell and as a living-place too.* The interned said that they were looking for higher spots in the woods to make their living quarters. *For life in this place was impossible. For this was true; one could not doubt it. Two of the men were already severely ill with malaria in a condemned prison*, an impossible abode that they had fitted up as a hospital . . .'

And then the Government Representative of General Affairs, Mr. Kiewit de Jonge, had the courage to state in the General Council, that this sombre information from Dr. Van Blankenstein had to be seen in the light of the fact, that the latter was not accustomed to these conditions in the *rimboe* (woods).

How nicely they explain it away, and their own actions too! And what a mentality they show! So one should first get used to the rimboe in order to be able to judge whether a place cut out of the jungle, 'in the middle of pools and marshes' is inhabitable or not, and also to be able to observe the conditions which have been described above in italics. And with a show of indignation the Government Deputy said to Mr. Stokvis, who had the courage to make some provoking remarks concerning the Digoel in this 'respectable company' – and it does not take much to annoy a company of this kind –:

'The Government wants no injustice, not even in exile. Mr. Stokvis himself could have understood this too.'

It is true that in a colony, where *right* is identical with the *power* of the government, in a formal sense 'injustice' cannot exist. The government can always call the most atrocious injustice 'justice' . . . Then the matter is formally in order. In a free country ruled by parliament the government can always be called to account by parliament and be overthrown, if its deeds clash with the general principles of justice of the nation. But in a colonised country such as Indonesia the people have no say in the organisation of their society. They have no legal power to prevent the unlawful deeds of

the government. The foreign government has the power to decide what is to be *called* justice and what injustice . . . The only right that the population has, is the *moral right of resistance* if oppression is becoming unbearable and the wrong done to it is becoming increasingly intolerable.

It is obvious how much the announced 'policy of regaining lost confidence' of De Graeff clashes with the methods he used to 'eradicate communism'. One could put forward the argument, that the recent rebellion had frightened the government, but that does not explain away the mass internment of people, without any trial, in the marshes of the Upper Digoel, which as such and the way in which it is done, contrary to Article 37 and 38 of the 'Indonesian form of government', is an act of vengeance. Artikel 37 Paragraph 1 of the Government Act of Dutch Indies runs as follows:
'The Governor-General can, in agreement with the Council of the Dutch Indies, appoint a particular place to live for those persons born within the Dutch Indies, in the interest of public peace and order, or can deny the same persons the right to live in certain parts of the Dutch Indies.'

Now every normal person knows, that by that 'particular place' the legislator could not possibly have meant an area cut out in the wilderness, in the middle of pools and marshes, but an *inhabited place* with a cultural and economic life, because internment *is not punishment*, but an administrative measure. The thought underlying the internment regulations is that the internee must have the opportunity in his new place of residence to support himself as reasonably as before. Now the *unlawfulness* of this mass internment is immediately obvious, in the light of the fact that the fate of the Indonesian exiles in the Upper Digoel is more deplorable than that of the most notorious criminals who served their time in various prisons in Indonesia. Article 38 of the Government Act says:
'In cases mentioned in articles 35, 36 and 37 there can be no decision from the Governor-General until *after the person in question* has been properly summoned *for his defence*. An official report must be made of the examination.'

In the practice of the latest internment this regulation is originally meant as a guarantee for the person involved, but it simply became a piece of paper. Instead of hearing the persons involved in their own defence, of which a report should be made, they simply gave them a series of *duplicated* questions which had also been provided with duplicated answers which they were requested to

sign. If they refused to sign this, they would be beaten, whipped, and they would be denied their food, until in despair they would sign. And in that way Mr. De Graeff found his more than fifteen hundred candidates for the Upper Digoel. Of course he could object that such practices as forcing 'confessions' and violence by the police took place behind his back and was the doing of the police officers, but that does not alter the fact that, since all this takes or took place under his regime, he is and will be the chief culprit in this reprehensible affair.

If the Governor-General De Graeff had been serious about his announced policy of regaining the lost confidence of the Indonesian population he should have acted differently than exiling a large number of people without a trial, without an examination, to the marshes of the Upper Digoel. Then he should also have had the courage to face the real and deep causes of the resistance movement and have tried to remove them.

But the political vision of a country squire who is accustomed to living in the red tape of the colonial bureaucracy and in the higher regions of diplomacy is quite different from the vision of someone from the people, familiar with the needs and wishes of the population. For this aristocrat the masses only seem to be a will-less object without their own feelings and thoughts, whose desires he presumes can be identified with those of a group 'intellectuals' who have no contact with the masses, either spiritually or in the framework of a party. It is well-known that as a result of the hard-line policy of the previous Governor-General Mr. Fock, many of this small group of intellectuals turned away from the government. They declared that, from an opportunist point of view, they did not value cooperation with the government anymore. But they have never become non-cooperators on *principle*. When Mr. De Graeff mentioned regaining the lost confidence he must have had the confidence of those individuals who are outside the *peoples*' organisations in mind. For it would have been very naive, to expect that his ethical flattery policy could induce the people's organisation to give up their non-cooperation principle, as long as the *principle* of the existing colonial government had not been changed radically. If he could win over this small group of intellectuals for government policy, then the colonial auhorities could boast that for the maintenance of Dutch authority in Indonesia it could not only count on the existing 'spine' of the Dutch colonial imperialism, namely the native rulers, but also on the loyal cooperators from the intelligentsia.

As a reward for their loyal attitude and willingness to cooperate, the government promised them that the distribution of seats between the various racial groups in the General Council would be altered in favour of the native element. A bill was brought in, containing among other things, a statement that the General Council would from then on consist of 30 Indonesians, at least 25 Dutchmen, and 3-5 foreign Asiatics. And this cancelled the Feber amendment and others of 1925 that had caused so much dismay among Indonesian cooperators. As you probably know, it was accepted first by the General Council and recently also by the Second Chamber of Parliament.

It is characteristic of the mentality of colonial imperialists and capitalists, that they have made such a fuss about this basically insignificant change in the composition of the General Council.

Especially in European colonial circles there was a fierce resistance to this Bill. And it was the president of the Java Bank, Mr. Trip himself, who took the initiative of arousing a strong reaction from the white section of the population against the plans of the Indonesian government. In less than no time he collected 12995 signatures of leading colonial Dutchmen on a petition to the Governor-General, to postpone the partial change of the General Council. In this petition is was professed that vital Dutch interests were involved. At the same time a fierce campaign against the Governor-General began in the European colonial press. In the interest of his employers, the salaried Chairman of the Indonesian Board of Trade, Mr. Treub, sounded the alarm with his brochure entitled: *Het gist in Indië* (Ferment in Indonesia). Mr. P. Staal, another respectable Dutchman, ex-Consul-General at Calcutta, mentioned in his brochure 'Our Eastern problems tested by experience in British India' as the best guarantee of Dutch interests: 'A government which by its determination shows a belief in its own power, which in small conflicts adopts a just and gentle attitude towards the natives, but which, as soon as a vital interest of our own people (i.e. the Dutch people, Author) is threatened, does not hesitate to be decisive and ruthless: the master.' One cannot find a better foundation of the theory of modern colonial policy of plunder. What Staal has said here, could as it were have been taken out of the mouth of Dutch colonial capitalists and imperialists.

This reactionary white front eventually did not miss its aim. At the

opening of the General Council in May 1928 Mr. De Graeff had to show his true colours and admit to the Indonesian nationalists, 'that Dutch leadership in this country will be indispensable for some time to come'. At the same time he divided the national movement into *evolutionary* nationalists who can depend on the sympathy of the government, and the 'revolutionary' nationalists, who would like to strangle their guardian and on whom the government keeps a careful eye. There is apparently a fundamental difference between those two groups. And that is why the so-called '*sound* nationalists' are warned against the so-called 'destructive nationalists'. It is clear what the objective is: to cause a split in national movements of all kinds that aim for united action. And this unity has been realised in the foundation of the Indonesian national Concentration, the P.P.P.K.I., against which a *white front* was propagated by the European reactionary press. In the explanatory Memorandum of the Provisional Report to the General Council it was suggested in so many words 'that only on the basis of the continuation of Dutch leadership could the people's movement expect sympathy from the government'.

This government declaration was like a bombshell thrown into the ranks of the . . . *credulous moderate nationalists*, who had entertained such high expectations of the flattering words of Mr. De Graeff on his entrance into office. In reply to this Government Declaration the intellectual society *Boedi Oetomo*, well known for its loyalty, published a manifesto, in which it called upon all Indonesian nationalists to 'remain united in their fight for national freedom'. The division of nationalists into 'evolutionaries' and 'revolutionaries' was called artificial and dismissed, because it seemed to be the government's answer to the 'unit of most of the nationalist organisations, which had taken so much effort to achieve, embodied in the P.P.P.K.I.' The manifesto ended with the following words:

'In reply to these threats to our unite there is only one road to take for every true nationalist, and this is a stronger unity, and a stronger organisation. Away with the conflict occurring among us, let the P.P.P.K.I. be our arbitrator if conflicts occur. Unity of action and the slogan: by our unbreakable unity to the freedom of Indonesia.' This manifesto was doubly sensational, because it originated with the moderate society Boedi Oetomo and not with a revolutionary party such as the P.N.I. or the P.S.I.I. For the Indonesian noncooperators – the Governor-General's statement was not unexpected, because they had always expected it to come sooner or

later. From a keen analysis of the colonial problem they have always understood that this highest representative of Dutch authority in Indonesia, whatever his personal opinions might be, could not act otherwise than he was doing. It is the logical consequence of the colonial system, which is based on the principle, that Indonesia, for the sake of the many millions that yearly flood into Holland from Indonesia, must eternally remain an appendix of Holland. Anyone who had a sound insight into colonial power distribution, would not expect much good from the offer for cooperation with the Government, however inviting it might seem. For this cooperation, such as the Governor-General suggests, really amounts to exercising *ethical violence* against the weak Indonesian party. One cannot call it cooperation, when the opponent has no choice but submit to the Government programme and the policy outlined in it. Real cooperation can only exist on the basis of mutual concessions; for instance, if the Government were willing, in place of the present defective election system, to create a new democratic system, in which the population could have an important influence on the composition of the General Council; if moreover the Government were willing to grant them the very urgent demands of the Indonesian national movement of all political shades for the abolition of the penal sanction of the Articles 161 bis, 153 bis and ter, in the Indonesian Penal Code, which continually hangs above the heads of the people and Trade Union Movements like a sword of Damocles. But the 'ethical' government does not want to be concerned with any of this. It might disturb the peace and quiet of the colonial capitalists. Even the proposal of the member of the General Council, R. M. Koesoemo Oetojo, to appoint Indonesians to be mayors, had to be refused by the Government for fear of the protest of the Dutch citizens who do not like an Indonesian at the head of a municipality of which they form part. When the people's organisation, the P.N.I. and the P.S.I.I. refused this disappointing offer, the 'ethical' and 'cold-blooded' government was extremely irritated and offended. In its 'Announcements on Subjects of General Interest', the now leading P.N.I. was discussed as follows:

'Under the leadership of the Bandung intellectuals, the P.N.I. has conquered an important place in the political field. Insofar as they do not organise the forces within their own organisation, they try to carry along various other societies. The enthusiasm of these young academics does not only appeal to the older people, but inspires youth to an even larger extent with the deceptive ideal of an in-

dependent Indonesia within a foreseeable future. The propaganda is regularly conducted according to a plan that has been considered and proposed by the Indonesian society at the Hague. Apart from the fact that the conjunction of circumstances doubtless shows precarious aspects, we must also mention that this ultra-nationalist movement has taken the view in advance that they will not participate in the existing political system; what the existing political order can offer is overlooked and where its ideas and ideals gain ground this seems to give rise to the tendency to turn one's back on the regime. The leaders of P.N.I. and the people it seems to attract most are young Indonesian people whose national task it should be either to help within the framework of the government or with the government in the construction of a new society.'

The above words are characteristic of the attitude of Governor-General De Graeff towards the Indonesian freedom movements. But this pronouncement also clearly shows his hypocrisy. He mentions young Indonesian people who turn their back on the regime. But how does Mr. De Graeff explain the fact that Indonesians, in spite of their service of many years' standing are brutally manoeuvred away from the colonial administration because they openly profess their ideals which do not please the government? Indeed the government has seen to it that in the bureaucracy of the colonial civil service there is no room for revolutionary Indonesian nationalists. Unlike the situation in a free country like Holland, the colonial government treats its Indonesian civil servants as nothing but objects of power or as wage-slaves.

It is understandable within the framework of the colonial system, that it is especially the P.N.I. that has fallen out of grace with Governor-General De Graeff, because this is the very party that consistently conducts propaganda campaigns for the freedom of Indonesia.

In the General Council the government deputy for General Affairs expressed his opinions in the following way, especially drawing attention to the activities of the P.N.I., that the government will not shrink from measures against those whose words might endanger Dutch authority. Of course the government itself will determine when that might be the case. The leaders of P.N.I. were severely admonished by the government deputy for General Affairs, always to walk the narrow path between what is just about admissible and what is inadmissible.

The abuse of power by the police against popular meetings

apparently is the order of the day again. At *Semarang* a propaganda meeting of the P.N.I. was closed by the police when Mr. Soekarno was reading and explaining the Declaration of Principles of the P.N.I., while the same explanation and reading had taken place more than thirty times in different places without police interference. On *Solo* Mr. Soekarno was allowed very little freedom of speech. The police forbade him to use the words *kemerdekaan* (freedom) and *pemerasan* (exploitation), forbade him to talk too long and warned him that they would ask him to sit down if he used words which did not please the police. The police terror, which we knew under the Fock regime and which had led to underground action, is beginning to assert itself under the 'ethical' regime of Mr. De Graeff.

Thus the deeds of the present Governor-General have recently often been in contradiction with the ethical policy which he professes to pursue in his statement that he would not be a true Dutchman if he had no respect for nationalist ideals.

Of this respect, flung at the Indonesian nationalists as a bait, we have not seen a trace so far. What does this respect mean, when the word 'freedom' cannot even be used at meetings? This respect is also difficult to reconcile with the imperialist policy that Dutch domination in Indonesia must be continued for an indefinite period. The ethical flattery policy of Governor-General De Graeff is basically a policy of *ethical violence.*[1]

As the highest officer of Dutch colonial imperialism he could not but be hostile to the Indonesian freedom movement. One would be guilty of self-deception if one had expected otherwise. But the Indonesian people, mindful of colonial history, which is rich in political trickery, will not be cheated again. It is becoming more and more obvious that colonial relations will continue to be ruled by irreconcilable conflicts of interest.

First published in *De Nieuwe Weg.*

1. Our contributor obviously means by this a quasi-ethical but fundamentally anti-ethical violence. R.H.

23 The organised terror against the national movement in Indonesia

Obstructions and arbitrary exercises of power by the colonial government against the normal growth of the national movement and labour organisations are numerous and unrestricted. They may be divided into two main groups: the *legal* arbitrariness and *arbitrariness by police action.*

The first group as its name already indicates, finds its support in the 'law'. These legal restrictions grow in number in proportion as the national movement grows in strength and size. Notorious are: the *exorbitant rights* of the Governor-General, which give him authority to banish people, when he considers them dangerous to the so-called public peace and order, even if they have done nothing that is contrary to the law; the *sow hatred clauses*, which make the incitement of hatred between various racial groups and against the legal authority punishable; the *clause 161 sub. 2* which makes strike action punishable; and finally the *clauses 153 sub. 2 and 3* which completely restrict the freedom of movement and the freedom of organisation.

Anyone who reads the wording of these clauses with care, will be struck by their 'elasticity', which affords the colonial government and the colonial judge considerable room to exercise their desire to repress.

Two years ago a judge managed to sentence an Indonesian woman, named Wara Ati, who had stated during a public assembly that she would never want a government employee for a son in law, *to a full year's imprisonment on the grounds of sowing hatred.* This fact is not alone in its kind.

The breaking up of the S.K.B.I., a new Indonesian labour-organisation, is a striking proof of the stretchability of the notorious anti-strike clause 161 sub. 2. The *suspicion* alone by the government, that sooner or later they *may decide* on strike action, is sufficient to arrest its leaders by the score and to disband the organisation.

Mr. Koesoema Soemantri, lawyer at Medan, was arrested at the

end of last July without any valid reason. At present he has been kept in preventive custody for already more than three months *without anyone knowing why he was locked up.* The arbitrary exercise of power even goes to the extent, that he is hardly allowed to correspond with his colleague Mr. Soenario on the subject of completion of the current affairs of his clients. Until recently this was allowed. Further it is said that he is certain to be banished, no matter what the result of the judicial investigation. It is a question now whether they will decide on a legal prosecution, when they cannot charge him with a single incriminating circumstance. What is easier for the government in this case than the exercise of its exorbitant authority, for which responsibility it has to account to no one, and to motivate its action by claiming the stretchable principle 'dangerous to the public peace and order'?

The notorious anti-incitement clauses 153 sub. 2 and 3 too have not missed their victims. Some leaders of the *Partai Sarikat Islam* (United Islamic Party) have been behind bars already for several years because they were guilty of 'fostering anti-government feeling'.

New measures

These 'legal' measures do not appear sufficient to the colonial authorities to confine the growth of the national movement. New legal measures are to be taken.

A draft decree has already been laid before the People's Counsel (House of representatives) to supplement the Dutch East Indies' Criminal Code with regulations 'to combat revolutionary disturbances'. The old 'uprising' clauses 107/109 are to be replaced by three new ones. The meaning of these alterations is said to be, 'that they are first and foremost directed against the leaders and organisers of a revolutionary movement, who at present stay beyond the limits of the law'. They are not exactly stingy in the determination of the measure of punishment; he, who brings others under arms against the authority, or who gives leadership to an uprising, is punished with life or temporary imprisonment with a maximum of twenty years.

But there is more to come! A clause 88 sub. 2 is in preparation too. Furthermore a clause 111 sub 2 which makes punishable one and all, who are *in communication* with persons or bodies domiciled *outside* the *Dutch East Indies* with the purpose of influencing

such persons or bodies *to give aid* to the *preparation, advancement,* or the *commencement* of an insurrection, etc.

It is clear that the new decree aims *to isolate the Indonesian national movement from one or other international relations.*

In view of the elasticity of the 'legal' decrees in Indonesia, it cannot be ruled out, that a contact with 'Perhimpoenan Indonesia' can be deemed punishable. For the P.I. has its seat in the Netherlands and as such is outside Indonesia. For the time being the 'not guilty' verdict of the court in The Hague in the sensational 'incitement case' of 'Perhimpoenan Indonesia' weighs heavily on the government. But who is out to beat a dog . . .!

One observes that the legal barriers the government is building around the Indonesian national movement, are getting higher and higher, and are getting more and more branches. In a later article I will deal with these legal obstructions in their historical-psychological context.

Police terror

I now pass on to the *second* group of obstructions, which manifest themselves principally in the purely arbitrary exercise of power by government and police officers.

Every police officer has the authority to interfere in the assemblies of people, to silence a speaker or to disperse the assembly, even if nothing of an 'inciting' nature to the letter of the law is being said. Lately arbitrary police action is directed particularly against the assemblies of the *Partai Nasional Indonesia* (P.N.I.).

From the numerous cases of such arbitrary police action I will quote only a few typical examples. Typical because each of these examples is not the only of its kind.

First: At the opening ceremony of the club building of the Jakarta division of the P.N.I. last September, speeches were made amongst others by Dr. Samai. In the middle of this oratory he was stopped by a policeman. But a higher ranking police officer did not agree to this arbitrary interference and announced that the speaker could continue. He stated that his subaltern had acted wrongly, as there had not been the slightest cause to silence the speaker!

Here one has arbitrariness that knows no bounds. In principle each police officer may judge independently if the spoken word is permissible or not.

Second: It is a known phenomenon that taxi-drivers like to decorate the front of their cabs with a flag of sorts. As the P.N.I. is very popular in Indonesia, many drivers display a small P.N.I. flag, red-white with a banteng-head in the middle in accordance with the standard of 'Perhimpoenan Indonesia', on the front of their taxis. This custom has not been forbidden by the authorities. But recently it happened at Manggala, a small place in the Lampong districts, that the police removed the flags from the taxis and confiscated the same. The *Bintang Timoer* which reported these facts noted: 'Are they afraid that the spirit of the P.N.I. will settle in the heads and hearts of the population of these districts?'

The fact itself is not of very much importance but illustrates the narrowmindedness of the colonial police and its fear of expansion of the nationalistic propaganda.

Third: Here we are concerned with the action of the administration of the Minahassa district against a leader of the local section of the P.N.I., reported in the *Persatoean Indonesia* on the 1st October.

On the 18th June, a raid was made on the home of Linuh, leader of the Minahassa section of the P.N.I., led by a sergeant and a corporal. Letters, photographs of the main directorate of the P.N.I. and a festival picture of the P.N.I. section Cheribon, of which section Linuh had been chairman, were confiscated. The motive for the raid was said to be the lecture Linuh had held at *Amoerang*, on which occasion he clearly *demonstrated* the difference between *communism* and *nationalism*, so that the people will clearly appreciate the *nationalist* rudiments of the P.N.I., which are based on the self-help principle. He wanted to emphasize this difference because the reactionaries are conducting a systematic hate-campaign against the P.N.I. and calling it a communist organisation. Mentioning this difference in defence of the nationalist principle was denounced as . . . communist propaganda!

Since the raid Linuh has had to report twice daily to the police sergeant, and is not allowed to leave his native village. His home is under guard by a plain-clothes constable; he is not allowed to contact his colleagues. During the investigation the police sergeant tried to persuade him to give false evidence concerning the P.N.I., which he refused. Further he is considered to be a communist because he answers the sergeant in Malay, his native language and not in Dutch! This arbitrary conduct by the administration speaks louder than words.

The *fourth* typical case of government action against the P.N.I. is the circular by the Army Command dated the 1st November last, in which it is decreed that membership of the P.N.I. is forbidden not only to all military personnel and civil servants of the War Department, but also to their wives, Children, resident family, housekeepers and servants.

One observes that even the servants of a person in government service, who themselves have nothing to do with the ruling authority, are shackled to the colonial slavery system. All this to prevent a rapid spread of the P.N.I. ideals!

But the freedom idea is growing, the freedom movement is on the march. No force in the world will be able to stop it anymore.

First published in *The Socialist*, 2nd yr., no. 59, 16th November 1929.

24 The raid on the Partai Nasional Indonesia

What will happen next?

Hardly six weeks have passed since I wrote an article in this paper about the arbitrary actions of the government against the leaders of the P.N.I., and of the police against its assemblies, as proof of the increased terror against the strongly growing national movement in Indonesia, and already now are we surprised by the spectacular news of the raid against the P.N.I. on the 29th December last.

The complete police-corps was mobilized in silence to raid simultaneously all circles of this popular people's party throughout the whole of Indonesia. This show of police power took place in more than 36 places, 27 on Java, 8 on Sumatra, and 1 on Celebes island.

A total of 500 homes were searched and more than 180 leading members of the P.N.I. arrested.

Under the whip of the reactionary press and of those Dutchmen hungry for repacious power, the colonial government has ably demonstrated how well prepared is the instrument of its power, the police, and how 'bravely' they have acquitted themselves of their task against defenceless people, who were unaware of having done wrong.

The instruction to the police allowed the use of force, if necessary, and ordered any excess to be forestalled, the use of weapons other than firearms being permitted.

The necessary arrangements were made to arouse the power hunger of the police. The agency bulletin of 'Aneta' reports that the action of the police had the character of a complete surprise. While the house-searches were going on, police patrols surveyed the native villages. They feel 'very satisfied' about the reliability of this power instrument in which until recently they appeared to discover symptoms of nationalist infection. For from the secret preparations to the raids nothing leaked out in advance.

The disquiet Pharisees seized by the nightmare of a threatened uprising now again can lay the hand on the heart and utter a sigh of relief: 'Heaven be praised, our final hour has not arrived as yet, our power instrument is still reliable and our power position has as yet proved unassailable.'

What is the reason?

Does the colonial government think that this show of force will increase its prestige?

This going-on only tends to show the utter weakness of the moral foundation of the Dutch colonial domination in Indonesia. An administration which loses its head at the slightest rumour and resorts to arbitrary use of power and show of force, can never be a strong government.

What would be the deeper background of this disgusting fascist terror?

Was it perhaps to divert public attention from the famine in Flores, a fact that could undermine the prestige of the so highly praised Dutch colonial administration?

Or was it the intention to organise a large scale police manoeuvre to test if anything was still lacking in this power instrument, and the people's most popular party, the P.N.I., its chosen target?

The official version is that the authorities had serious indication that the intention existed in the circles of the P.N.I. to create organised rioting and uprising at the change of the year.

To obtain positive evidence the executive branch of the Ministry of Justice ordered simultaneous house searches at the homes of directors and leaders of the P.N.I. everywhere in Indonesia where this party has its branches. It was said that the information coming to the police mentioned dates on which the resistance movement was to be activated.

What is the truth of these serious indications supposed to be in the hands of the authorities?

The suggestion of this sensational argument was soon cancelled out by the very same 'Aneta' messages that reported them first, 'that sofar from the confiscated documents no confirmation was obtained about riots expected in the near future'.

If one takes account of the factual situation, that at the very time this uprising was to be led, the principal leaders of the P.N.I. were

not present in their districts, one must be a great fanatic to believe in the existence of such plans other than in the mind of provocative agents.

Could ever a battle be fought successfully if the commanders were amusing themselves elsewhere instead of being at their stations? Mr. Sartong was at Solo (Surakarta) instead of Jakarta, (Batavia), probably visiting his parents, while Ir. Soekarno and Gatot Mangkoepradja were at Djokjakarta to attend the youth congress. This youth congress itself was already a memorable occasion in the annals of the Indonesian Youth Movement because Jong Java (Young Java) disbanded to absorb itself in the higher unity of a General Indonesian Youth Organisation, so their presence there was to give a certain standing to the decisions to be taken. Ir. Anwari and others too were travelling. The fact that several of the arrested leaders had to be freed after interrogation shows the weakness of the grounds on which the sensational raids and arrests were made.

Increased reaction

But the effect of this power-hungry display will not be lost. If later on the investigation of the carloads of confiscated papers proves to be a blunder and fiasco for the government, one will find means aplenty to 'save' the 'prestige' of the administration.

For the Governor-General possesses the exorbitant power to enable him to banish the leaders without due process. In this matter he answers to no one, intervention by judicial departments is not possible, it is sufficient for him to claim the flexible principle of 'dangerous to public peace and order'. Will there arise next to Boven Digoel a new internment camp? May be an 'island for intellectuals' to which the leaders of the P.N.I., the academically schooled, the highschool graduates and those trained in technical colleges will be deported? The unlimited power of the colonial government will present us with ever new surprises! The Semarang newspaper *De Locomotief* is already suggesting that it is certain that several leaders will be interned.

Another effect already visible is the increased activity of the colonial reactionaries.

Mr. Fruin, one of the leaders of the Vaderlandse Club (Fatherland club) – the notorious Dutch bloc – commences already by pressing the government to declare the P.N.I. to be 'contrary to

public order'. Further he asked, awaiting this declaration, is the government prepared to limit the right of assembly for the P.N.I. in the whole of Indonesia.

On top of all this observe that the administration made clever use of the rumours, probably spread by provocative agents, about insurrection in 1930, to beat the P.N.I. down.

They lay in waiting for a long time for the opportunity to present itself to arrest the progress of this party on account of its increasing popularity. The government delegate for General Affairs prepared the way by declaring before the People's Council, that the leaders of the P.N.I. were not only responsible for what they said during the assemblies, *but also for the eventual consequences of their words.* This speaks loudly! In a country under colonial rule it is not difficult to produce a casual connection between two facts, which are truly unconnected.

The battle continues!

Thus far to a government calling itself ethical, acceptable motives were lacking to interfere by force with the action of the P.N.I.

Its leaders have carefully attempted not to collide with the legal barbed wire and muzzle-decrees, as this might have cost the party its existence.

Much to the vexation of the administration itself! They tried to repress its popularity with the people by means of police interference at the assemblies. But this only produced the opposite result!

That is why they now have to resort to open violence, show of force, and intimidation. The list of party members was confiscated, and guided by this list they will start to press the members to resign their membership of the P.N.I. These sensational raids and the incrimination of the character of the P.N.I. that followed, are in fact no more than an extension of the cherished desire to keep the population aloof from this party.

Do they really expect to strangle the P.N.I. in this manner? In its short period of existence it has already managed to create such a strong social, economic and political base that it cannot be torn out of the Indonesian soil, which it fertilises with its wonderful ideals. It is living already in the heart of the Indonesian people! Maybe on this occasion leaders will fall victim to the arbitrary use of power, but new ones will arise to continue the work of their predecessors. But let the brute colonial government not dare a second

time wantonly to create an underground action, by systematically repressing public action! At this critical moment we again issue a warning as we did five years ago. A warning which came true!

This most recent incident is once again to us proof of what a people's party in Indonesia may expect once it gains popularity. The fear of increased commotion in the whole Asiatic world has the Dutch rulers sadly in its clutches. The latest demands of the All-India National Congress make them even more concerned about the spread of freedom ideals, which the P.N.I. especially propagates openly.

Truly they have reassured themselves with the announcement that the membership of the P.N.I. totals less than 10,000, but one cannot deny the reality that the sphere of influence of this party reaches far beyond its numbers. For in a country where arbitrary use of power and organised terror are the rule, where the membership of a radical nationalist party is exposed to so many dangers, both for self and family, only a small nucleus of a few thousand will dare to profess openly the principles and ideals held. The great mass of silent adherents, no matter how devoted to national affairs, will always remain invisible. But that will not mean that they are a negligible quantity as far as power formation is concerned! The administration is well aware that the number alone of membership is a poor measure to determine the power position of the P.N.I. Why otherwise this great hullaballoo, if it were true, that except for a few places in the Preanger and West Java this party does not reach the heart of the masses? Surely not to make themselves look ridiculous?

The sensational raid – it is now clear – serves to destroy the popularity of the P.N.I. and to confine the circle of its silent adherents. Where the legal measures to this purpose are absent – notwithstanding a very extensive criminal Code – only the weapon of force remains to the government.

The only weapon with which an unpopular administration believes to be able to keep its prestige high.

For the future leaders, who have the duty to continue the work of their imprisoned predecessors, a lot can be learned from this new episode of raids!

But will the Dutch working class remain unmoved by this new Tragedy to my people?

First published in *The Socialist*, 2nd yr., Friday, the 10th January 1930.

25 The destruction of the P.N.I.

The judgment of Bandung

Finally the judgment of the Council of Bandung has fallen in the affair of the 4 leaders of the P.N.I. After a long procedure of more than 3½ months and after the accused have suffered almost a year of preventive detention in a cell barely 1½ by 2½ m.

A condemning sentence such as we never otherwise had expected from a colonial racial justice which has above all to keep up the prestige of the authorities. They are not stingy people in meting out punishment. It must be so as otherwise people would doubt the gravity of the accusation.

Ir. Soekarno gets 4 years, Gatot Mangkoeparadja 2 years, Maskoen 1 year and 8 months and Soepriadinata 1 year 3 months.

It is said they have been guilty of participation in an association that works against the State.

This is the limit! This 'lawful' detention is the purpose of the whole comedy that has been played since 29th December, 1929. From the start it has been the intention to destroy the P.N.I.

Already from August of last year (1929) a regular campaign was started against this association when it appeared that its influence over the population was growing steadily. There is hardly a corner of the Indonesian land where the name of the P.N.I. is not pronounced with respect by the man in the street, who himself does not belong to any political party. The P.N.I. known among the people as the *Kepala Banteng* (Buffalo Head) tells the people openly that its aim is to achieve the *independence of Indonesia*. By this means it touches a responsive string in the heart of every feeling man.

One does not fear the party itself which as a result of strict selection in accepting them does not have more than 10,000 members, who for the greater part are concentrated in the Preanger. No, the party by itself cannot hurt a fly. What makes the colonial head and justice angry (they both sleep under one blanket) is the quiet strength *that goes out from it to the masses of millions* – and its

anonymous followers among the people. To stem the desire for freedom the trouble must be torn out at the root.

Herein lies the explanation of the increased reaction against the P.N.I. since August 1929. One only need remember the circulars of the army command and of the Governor of West Java against the membership of the P.N.I. and the constantly more brutal action of the police on meetings of the people. These were only the forerunners of the forthcoming great offensive.

A legal comedy

In the light of all this it is readily understandable why the colonial power did not proceed to intern Soekarno despite the fact that the entire colonial reaction and the Procurator General repeatedly urged them to do so. In view of Soekarno's great popularity among the masses, this easy method was obvious. But they understood – and here lies the danger of colonial ethics – that in this way they would not destroy the P.N.I., they would not kill the spirit of freedom, but – to the contrary – would strengthen them. This would have made Soekarno a great martyr and this would only have goaded his supporters into stronger action. And they wanted to avoid that at any cost.

That is why they had recourse to the comedy of a 'judicial inquiry'. In this weapon the government possesses a 'legal' means for destroying the P.N.I.

For does not the case rest on the result of an 'impartial judicial inquiry'?

A long process of more than 3½ months in which not less than 113 witnesses were present, must help to disperse any doubt about the legal object. But sad to say many well-thinking men have been duped – even the Indonesian press.

They were led astray by the calm, dignified and amiable behaviour of the president and expected that the case would be treated in a fair way. Once confident of this one could only expect an acquittal, for everyone is convinced that the P.N.I. has no bad intention and that they had nothing to do with the charges against them. This conviction became stronger when one heard the conflicting declarations of the Indonesian witnesses who gave the strong impression of having had words put into their mouths. Furthermore, everyone was indignant over the hollow testimonies of the police

'witness' Albreghs whose declarations were without rhyme or reason. Perhaps because of the transparency of those unfounded accusations, and impressed by the uprightness of the president, the defendants did not bother to disprove one by one the so-called testimonies, especially those of Albreghs. Mr. Sastromoeljono insisted that the whole appearance of this witness was in direct conflict with the law. In the complete assurance that an acquittal would follow, by the end of his pleading he shouted 'Judges, do your duty!' Mr. Sastromoeljono, to whose keenness we are pleased to pay homage forgot at that moment that he was dealing with a colonial judge, who in political matters administers not law but authority.

The clever and convincing plea of the 3 defendants failed to save the affair of Soekarno and his friends because it was arranged in advance that they must be condemned, in order that through them the P.N.I. would be hit, which was the whole purpose of the matter. With this sentence the dissolution of the P.N.I. was expected.

We do not wish to discuss this judgment in detail. Anyone who has any view on this case and any understanding of rights or law, discovers therein a monster of judicial impudence. It is in a sense understandable that in a case of accusation facts are combined, which do not show a cause, but at most a succession of historic facts, but that such a situation can occur in a judgment . . .!!

Judgment without proof

It is noteworthy that the judgment begins with the remark that the P.N.I. is striving to get the complete and final freedom of Indonesia, so the Court of Justice concludes that its final purpose is 'the complete end of the present lawful form of Government'.

What nationalist party does not wish that? But in that justice already sees the alleged 'plot against the state'.

Whilst the P.N.I. nowhere talks of violence, yes, and Soekarno himself has many times in public, in closed meetings and in writing, opposed violence, the judge finds in this a ready motive to declare that 'the P.N.I. nowhere recognises open means, hence deliberately concealed means', that is to say violence by which it imagines it will obtain the freedom it aspires to.

'Evidence' can be invented or at any rate conveniently found from the declarations under pressure of witnesses, which Hadji

Salim at the time emphasises in this paper and the truth of which was later proved by Sjahrir.

This – the plot against the State – is the cardinal point on which the P.N.I. is to be destroyed. All the other incoherent and unprovable 'arguments' in the long-winded sentence serve only to give weight to the cardinal point.

The trickery of the colonial Judge is even too much for a liberal paper like the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* (evening edition of the 22nd December last), so that as regards these paramount factors they gave it as their opinion that with respect to two of the charges, namely provocation to conspire and incitement to strikes prejudicial to public order, the charges have *not* been proved. That says a lot.

The struggle goes on

We will conclude by mentioning a remarkable fact that shows off the character of the whole affair.

As will be remembered, the great elaborate police raid of the 29th December 1929 was motivated by the claim that the Public Prosecutor had received information that the P.N.I. intended to cause a rebellion at the New Year. This was one of the charges in the indictment. Also in the Judgment the P.N.I. were declared guilty of spreading false information which certainly had a relation to the rumours of revolt. But in direct line against all these revolts is this testimony of the representative of the Government, Ir. Mr. Kiewit de Jonge, who declared that he had several times received a guarantee from Mr. Soekarno that the P.N.I. would not act on incidents, whilst Soekarno himself, with regard to rumours of revolt declared himself ready to collaborate in preventing it. To this end he was to lend his mediation to bring about an interview between the Commissioner and Ir. Soekarno. The arrest of Ir. Soekarno prevented the visit.

The violence the P.N.I. is accused of is contradicted by the declaration of the Government's Deputy. In spite of it they had to confirm a verdict of guilty because the P.N.I. must be annihilated.

But we know this! We never had any illusions that the predominantly political proceedings would end with an acquittal. This would be showing up the government and justice. A conviction is necessary to give the Government a 'lawful and legal' means to destroy the P.N.I.

But if the State and Justice think that they can in this way suppress the movement for freedom, then they will soon discover their mistake.

At the best they can only make the political leaders of the radical movement harmless and kill them politically, but the struggle for freedom is not therefore wrecked.

The only result of this measure will be that the awakened masses and the unorganised nameless fighters for the Indonesian cause will follow their own path, the consequences of which cannot be ignored. Let the colonial ruler dig his own grave!

First published in *De Socialist*, 4th yr., no. 118, 2nd January 1931.

26 Youth in crisis

The problem of youth in crisis is no longer a problem which is peculiar to Indonesia, but it has become a world problem. Practically everywhere in the world the young people are undergoing crises. They are trained for various types of jobs, but after this society does not give them a proper place. This is the root of all the crises within the world of youth, crises which affect their attitudes, character, spirit and their point of view.

Let us have a brief look at the situation in Europe. Before the Great War there was hardly any problem of youth. The problem of youth in those days existed only in countries where people were not free, such as in Austria, Hungary, Russia etc. In those countries youth already interfered with politics and they engaged in political movements even while they were still at school. These were regarded at the excesses of youth because these were extraordinary phenomena for the western world of that time.

What was even more surprising was that it was not merely the young people belonging to ordinary families who plunged into political action, but also the sons and daughters of the aristocracy. Events of this kind were met with particularly in Tsarist Russia.

The tyrannical government of the Tsar in Russia was well known all over the world. His government was concerned only with maintaining its own power and neglected the livelihood of the people. No education was provided for the ordinary people. Quite to the contrary, the feudal government regarded education as a potential danger. If the people were to be educated, their eyes would be opened and they would see the position in which they found themselves and they would find the courage to fight for their rights. And surely people who know how to think would constitute a danger to the Tsar. That was the reason why education was only provided for the children of the aristocracy and this was something which those people considered to be quite right and

proper. Because it was from this group of people that they chose those who were to become the civil servants. These were then the people who were to become the bone and sinews of the autocratic government of the Tsar. Education for the ordinary people was either not provided at all or only on a very restricted scale. And in any case the provision of education for the children of commoners or peasants was prohibited if it had not received the sanction of those in authority. In this way the people were kept in ignorance. There were no people anywhere who were as ignorant as the people of Russia; and there were no people anywhere whose lives were so wretched as those of the people of Russia.

After seeing the extremely miserable conditions of the people, the eyes of a number of young men of aristocratic families were opened, as well as those of the middle classes. They themselves felt guilty when they saw that the future of the people was destroyed and the people themselves were oppressed by the members of their own class. These thoughts gave rise to a spirit of romanticism in their breasts. Who else, if not the young themselves, could open their eyes to their rights and could awaken the people from their long darkness. The people could not possibly know the way, nor could they even know how to think. All this had to be revealed to them. They had to be shown by way of examples of heroism and self-sacrifice. It only takes a few people to open up the eyes of the general public. That was why the young aristocrats who were used to the finer things of life sacrificed themselves in the name of public interest. It was not because they felt that in any way they belonged to the common people, not because they had any spirit of socialism in the way they looked at the lot of the masses, but to them it was nothing more than the result of their pity when seeing the miserable lives of ordinary people.

The children of well-to-do parents left their homes, sacrificing a life of pleasure for one of misery, leaving behind them a life in palaces and exquisite villas for a life in exile. There were some of them who went and lived like commoners in the villages, trying to pass on their knowledge to the people so that their eyes would be opened. Girls and youths who had enjoyed the privileges of university education would go and become village teachers. They carried on doing this right up to the time when the government officials of the Tsar rounded them up and sent them to banishment in Siberia because they had broken the order which prohibited them to teach. But there were also among them certain who plunged into the work

of secret movements. These became political propagandists in districts and villages right up to the time when they were caught by the host of spies with which the entire country was riddled.

So at this time there were many types of job which were done by youths who were influenced by the spirit of romanticism (in the political sense of the term). Such events were regarded by the authorities as crises among youth. It is true that the position was extremely different from what it should have been. For this reason youths were often regarded with pity, regarded as people who were slightly mad or who were too much influenced by melancholy. Moreover, the education of the upper classes was carried out by western European methods, mainly on the basis of the French system. In the upper classes of Russia, the French language was regarded as the language of culture. In everyday life, it was French which they spoke in their own homes in order to show that they were civilised people. Their own language, Russian, was regarded as mean and contemptible. That is why the upper classes in Russia were very fluent when they spoke French, but their tongues were stiff and difficult to control when they were called upon to speak their own language. But for those people who viewed the situation calmly and objectively, the crises through which youth was passing were neither 'madness' nor 'melancholy', but they were crises of conscience. The young people of the time had chosen the attitude and the steps they were going to take in the course of their lives. This was the real nature of these crises of youth.

This was very different from the position in western Europe at that time, where people had achieved democracy, even though the democracy they had achieved was not yet perfect. In those countries, youth displayed no interest in serious problems such as the misfortunes of the common people or government policy. They were interested only in their own studies, during which time they were expected to 'enjoy their youth and have a carefree life'. The motto one heard from time to time was 'we are young and youth is wonderful'. In those countries they did not display any interest in politics. This is hardly surprising, because in a free country which possesses the means of criticising its own democratic government and where all the people play their part in playing down the pattern of government and in overthrowing a government which is out of favour, it is not necessary for the work of propaganda and criticism to be carried out by young people who are still at school. At school the young people will wait until the time comes. In the mean-

time they must be preparing themselves for fitness for the task they have to take on later. That was why the life of western youth seemed to be divided equally between two fields: that of study and that of pleasure. But a change took place in this field after the war which disrupted the life of the Allies in Europe. Now youth begins to think about the situation which will face them when they have finished their studies. The technological revolution which followed the Great War reached such a level that a continuous condition of unemployment came into being. There were millions of unemployed and there were queues and queues of unemployed people everywhere, so that there were no longer any secure places of employment for young people leaving school: all there was to welcome them then was the great mass of the unemployed.

In a situation of this kind, there occurred an enormous crisis in the spirit of the young. Right from their youth they were now obliged to think about their lives in the future. Openings for work became fewer and fewer, whilst on the other hand the number of young people seeking jobs increased. It was against a background of this type of thought and anxiety that a feeling of hate against existing society came into being. Youth underwent crises and chose to take up the attitude of revolution. But this was not a revolutionary attitude brought about by a conviction regarding ideals or thoughts regarding society, but a revolutionary attitude which had come into being because of the hatred they bore of existing society. They felt that whatever kind of society might come into being, it could not be worse than the society which was already in existence. For this reason youths of today are apt too easily to think in terms of joining the Nazi party. Tomorrow, they might turn right round to the extreme left and join the Communist party. Even though young people are generally regarded as being educated and capable of thinking for themselves, it is still very easy for them to turn round from the extreme left to the extreme right and vice versa. This is proof of the fact that youth is not driven by conviction but by confusion. When they find themselves in a situation such as this, their sentiments and feelings are very easily attracted by Nazi propaganda. Youth suffering crisis can easily become prey to fascists.

Such is the situation of youth in the western world. Even if it would not be true to say that all of them are in that position, nevertheless there is no doubt that the majority of them find themselves in a crisis of misery.

What is the condition of youth in Indonesia?

In this country youth easily grows to maturity because right since childhood they have been forced to think about serious matters regarding society and the life of the people. In many ways the situation here is similar to the situation which obtained regarding Russian youth and the youth of other Central European countries when they first started to observe what was going on around them and to interfere in politics. In countries which have been colonised, politics does not necessarily mean a struggle in parliament, but is more likely to imply propaganda for the freedom of the nation and propaganda to whip up the enthusiasm of the people. Here politics means education.

Who else, if not youth, will be the very first to feel the national insult involved in being graded as a nation which is not free? Wherever they look, they see their own nation being insulted by the press and by the leaders of the conquering people. At school they are taught to admire the great figures of the western world, such as William Tell, Mazzini, Garibaldi, William of Orange and so forth, whilst at the same time all their own national figures are continually insulted. Moreover, they are trained from the very start to call them 'terrorists'.

In addition to that, it must be remembered that a large number of Indonesian youths who were able to enjoy the benefits of Western education originated from the aristocracy and the upper classes. Most of them were children of noble families who worked for the government. And it has come to be regarded as the proper thing in colonial government regulations that it is wrong for a civil servant to criticise the government of which he himself forms part. For this reason the parents at home were compelled to keep their mouths shut and to hide the real situations from their children. To honest children – and honesty is in fact one of the principal characteristics of the children – the attitudes of their parents were regarded as false. They did not understand the motives underlying their parents' diplomacy. Therefore many of them came to feel that their upbringing at home was based on lies and falsehood. This is a situation that can create nothing short of havoc in the hearts of many young people. From that time onwards many young people have been passing through a time of crisis. There have been events when children were influenced by a sense of self-sacrifice and left their homes and separated from their parents who were living in support of the government, so as to safeguard the ideals which were burning in their breasts. But in actual fact it was fear that many

young people started to undergo the most miserable crisis of all. Their hearts and their passions were strong enough to defend the interests of the nation, but the actual constructive steps they could take were restricted. So long as Indonesian youth continues to live with ideals, thinking in terms of political romanticism and visualising the face of Indonesia in times to come, they can still determine their role in the struggle which will have to take place before we can achieve our country's dreams. They do not wish to be left behind by their contemporaries. But whenever they try to set their steps in the direction of the real struggle, it is then that they feel that their feet are tied and they do not know what to do. They do not know how they ought to work and how they ought to employ their talents, skills and knowledge within the framework of Indonesian society, which is very much behind in every field.

They obtain their education from the colonial education system which is based in the first place on utilitarianism. When big plantations are installed in the country after the culture system has been abolished and when the government itself exchanges powers across the ocean, Netherlands Indies society requires cheap and efficient labour. The education system is being developed so that it falls in line with the interests and requirements of the people who arrive from abroad. The native people are trained to become labourers in the Netherlands Indies, to be the tools of power.

That is why it so often happens that the burning ideals held during school days became cold and dank when they got back into their own society. Just have a glance at the youth movements that are offered from Young Java, Young Sumatra League, Young Ambon, Young Minahassa, Young Islamite League right down to the Indonesian Youth. How many young leaders there are who explain their noble ideals in magazines and in public in such glowing terms, glowing terms which attract both young and old. Anyone who cares to listen to their words and read their theories will say with joy and hope: 'Here lies the hope of our nation. These are our leaders of the future and these are the ones who later on will take the places of our present leaders'. But how many of the leaders of Young Java, Young Sumatra League, Young Ambon, Young Minahassa, Young Islamite League and Indonesian Youth will really find their way into the people's movement. How many of them will keep the promise that they will become the leaders of the people who are living in darkness? Most of them find that they are wedged on the pillars of Netherlands Indies and find that they are unable to pass through

the barriers which separate Indonesia from the Netherlands Indies. This majority of them continues to act as civil servants, in accordance with the traditions of their own class. This is not because they do not love free Indonesia any more, but because their way of life has been adapted to fit in with the Netherlands Indies, and their principles have followed suit. They have grown up under conditions which make them feel that they are incapable of doing anything else and they have no freedom of choice.

This is the way Indonesian intellectuals feel about it. They feel that Indonesian intellectuals are torn away from the ways of life of their own nation and their own people.

The Dutch say that this is caused by a western education, which in the long run might prove to be a hazard to the government itself. They say that in this way the government is educating the intellectual proletariat, the very people who will bring about the labour revolution.

This assumption has been proved wrong. The Indonesian intellectuals have been torn out of the way of life of the Indonesian people, not due to the fact that they have been educated in the western manner, but because the colonial education system is based as it is. It is obvious from what has been said that the majority of young Indonesians who have received their training through colonial education find in the long run that their original ideals have begun to pale. They grow up into people who feel incapable of working on their own and taking initiative.

The superiority of western education is to be found in their systematic science and their highly developed technology. This is proved by Japan, a country which has taken over the western education system and has used it to combat and beat the west itself. It is also obvious from the Soviet Union, where western education methods have been adjusted to fit in with the objectives of their own society. Science and technology are dangerous internationally only when they are misused. Science begets knowledge and knowledge provides the basis of courage to contradict what is known to be wrong and to stand for what is right and just. Consequently a perfect system of education is bound to produce revolutionaries in any society where there is a position of inferiority. This is a fundamental law of nature. It is only education of the colonial type which can temporarily dam up the progress of the law of evolution.

At the present moment the young people of Indonesia are facing a crisis which is both sad and violent. There is much talk of their having been educated for the interests of the Netherlands Indies,

that is to say the other side of our society. Yet the space which can be inhabited in the Netherlands Indies is already overcrowded. People are already beginning to talk of signs of 'intellectual over-production'. Once this started to happen our Indonesian young people began to feel unwanted and useless. If the route along which they have passed through all this is now closed, where are they to go?

In a situation such as this, the youth of Indonesia is experiencing a crisis which in the long run will probably make the decision for youth. It is no longer possible for them to travel along the old familiar path. The problem has now become: 'How to find the way back into one's own society.'

It is high time that everyone's eyes should be open to the fact that Netherlands Indies and Indonesia are not one and the same thing. Netherlands Indies primarily is a term which signifies the status and power of the Dutch government, complete with its instruments of government and administration. For after all Netherlands Indies is a Dutch association which came here to seek its fortune, consisting of plantations and cities that breed a modern and capitalistic economy. The total number of the population involved at the present time is not more than 60,000, and the Dutch, Eurasian and native persons labouring there are nothing more than the mere instruments used for working the machinery of administration.

Existing by the side of and around the Netherlands Indies community there is a society which is called Indonesia. It is an extremely vast society and yet one which is still very backward in everything. It is a society which is uncared for. Which is left to its own devices and which does not possess the modern means for the achievement of progress. This is a society which offers vast fields in which young Indonesians can work and apply their knowledge. There is plenty room for political, social and economic work, each according to the type of training they have received. It is only supplies which are not so good as in the Netherlands Indies. There any new people who arrive merely carry on the work which was started by the exports and officials before them. Here, on the other hand, a new person has to start off from scratch, finding out for himself the way he has to take, finding out what he has to save and what he has to destroy. Here he has to be prepared to make sacrifices and not to live a life of pleasure, so that he can try really hard to create something which is truly new, so that he does not work like an automation which follows a mere old formula – this is the only way in which he will be able to lead Indonesia into a life of progress.

I sav this to all Indonesian young people who are already really aware that they are called upon to go back to their own society and who know how they can release their spirits from the influence of colonialism, who are prepared to leave aside the way of life of Netherlands Indies complete with its pleasures and are prepared to adjust their lives to fit in with the lives of their own people and still know how to mix their own people, I say to them, throw away from your backs any civil burdens or burdens originating in class differences and differences of origin and in this way you will come right back into Indonesian society. These are the conditions on which you can find your way home.

If the Indonesian youth with western education know how to find the way home to their own people they will find a release from the crisis of sadness and violence which is shaking them psychologically at the present time. If they are not able to do this, they will be drowned in the sea of life, or at any rate they will be lost for ever. Their lives will then be the lives of wandering travellers in a society of a different kind which can no longer make use of them and feed them, whilst every year their number will be increased by those who have just left school.

If Indonesian people who have been given a western education are unable to take the path home, then this will be very unfortunate for the Indonesian people. But the Indonesian people will still manage. Whether or not they have the advantage of modern educated youth in their midst, the Indonesian people will continue to make progress, will continue to fight for its ideals and to improve its lot. There was a time when the proletariat looked at intellectuals as though they were looking at pearls of great price. There were times when they ceremoniously raised both their hands constantly in welcome to their young future leaders. But these times have passed. The people who are crying out for leadership still value their intellectuals, but they are no longer dreaming about 'a leader who will never come'.

Moreover there are at the present time many young people from the proletariat who have been trained in struggling for freedom. So far as science and learning is concerned, these are at a disadvantage compared with their brothers who had the benefits of a western education. But as regards character and moral fibre they do not lack anything, indeed they are at much higher level. And they are better men and women for the enthusiasm and spirit which they bear, as compared with the position of the intellectuals, because

they have been brought up in and are living in their own society. The development of young leaders in the proletariat lowered the value of Indonesian intellectuals who have shown that hopes deposited in them are hopes in vain.

These are all facts which must be considered very carefully by all those Indonesian young people who have been given a western education. When we talk of 'youth in crisis' we are talking of young people who are being called upon to take a grave decision. Do they wish to return to their own society or not? There is no question here of an alternative! There is, indeed, no option!

First published in *Daulat Rakjat*, no. 77, 30th October 1933.

27 The verdict of the District Court of Bandung

At last a verdict has been pronounced in the lawsuit against the Indonesian National Party, which had been going on for months. Dr. Soekarno has been sentenced to four years, Gatot Mangkoepradja to two years, Maskoen to one year and eight months and Soepriadinata to fifteen months.

The whole of Indonesia should show its disgust at this verdict. The people of Indonesia and those who believe in truth cannot believe that the P.N.I. (Indonesian National Party) was guilty. Is it our wish to be suppressed by the Dutch and prevented from criticising what we know to be wrong? There is no creature whatsoever on this earth, no authority and no power that can deny us the right to criticise what is wrong. This is the very basis of the power of public opinion.

Workers in the Netherlands have added their voice of violent criticism to the tyranny which has been promulgated by the Bandung District Court. Right up to the time of writing this paper we have seen the actions of the S.D.A.P. At every Christmas meeting they protested against the injustice of this verdict. And on 4th January in Amsterdam it expressed its disgust for the tyrannical verdict passed on four of our brothers. We are also told that there are other groups of workers who would speak along these lines. The Indonesian Association also took part in this protest, both by making statements and by arranging public meetings outside the Netherlands. In the long run, the National Independence Movement in Indonesia will be recognised and will be legally approved by all those who are honest, who love the truth and who are desirous of justice. Even Western bourgeoisie have at last begun to become aware of the rights possessed by every nation to be free from the control of foreign nations and to enjoy their own sovereignty. Even though the number is still very small, the actions we are taking now will ensure that more and more eyes are opened to the truth.

It is therefore essential that all Indonesians should raise their voices and show that they do not approve of the tyranny of the action taken against the Indonesian National Party. Their voice should be heard all over the world, and it will then not be wasted on those who are in power in our own country. Our disgust at this tyranny must be expressed at all our meetings and in the press. If we remain silent, the white press and the reactionaries will become more and more arrogant and in the end force the government to dissolve the Indonesian National Party.

One fact which we must primarily be fully aware of is that the verdict of the District Court of Bandung really strikes at the heart of the Indonesian National Party. It is true that it was four of our leaders who were sentenced, but in actual fact it is the Indonesian National Party which is placed in jeopardy. These leaders were sentenced because they were suspected of taking part in an association 'whose aim it was to overthrow by violence the government of the Netherlands Indies'.

With an accusation of that kind contained in the verdict of the Court, it would be possible later on for the government to prohibit the existence of the Indonesian National Party.

This should give us sufficient proof of how devious the tactics are. According to the law, a lower court of law does not possess the power to decide whether or not a political association can come into being. It is only the Supreme Court of Indonesia which can do this. Likewise it is not the duty of the Supreme Court to deal with criminal cases, but with cases of civil law.

Now with the verdict of the District Court of Bandung, the government has found a back door through which it can prohibit the existence of the Indonesian National Party if the government should desire at any time to do so. It would easily be possible later on to dissolve this party without requiring the decision of the Supreme Court of Indonesia. This is the true meaning in depth of the verdict promulgated by the Bandung District Court!

These four of our brothers have all appealed to a higher court, even though one of them, Soepriadinata, in a very short time will almost have finished his sentence. He has already been in prison for one year and the sentence which was passed on him was for one year and three months. This clearly shows his motives for his actions. It is not for himself that he can have appealed, but for our party. We greatly admire the witness which is being borne by our four leaders.

Of course we cannot tell at this stage what the decision of the second court will be. If the court is just, our four leaders will be released and there will be no danger to the Indonesian National Party. But we cannot hide our anxiety on the question of whether the court will be truly impartial. We all realise that in actual fact this case is a political case. It is a case in which the voices of the spirit of our nation and of nationalism are bound to be heard. But judges are only ordinary mortals. Even though it may not be their intent, it is very easy for partiality to occur. Because of the nature of their job, these judges are not very well informed about the tactics of politics. On the other hand, it must be admitted that their sentiments are very much more moderate than those set out in the white press which never fails to vituperate every day.

The lesson which we have to learn from all this is as follows. It is not sufficient for us merely to hope for the truth. It is not sufficient for us to merely wait for a verdict to be handed down from above. It is not sufficient for us to entrust the defence to the accused themselves and their counsels for the defence. When cases are connected with politics it is the people and the people alone who can provide the strongest defence. It is the people who must defend the Indonesian National Party and show what their true feelings are. It is the people who must show that the Indonesian National Party is not guilty, that its movement bears no malice and that its actions are always directed towards the truth. I call upon you all to cooperate at this moment. This is the best time for you to show your loyalty to the Indonesian National Party.

Anyone who is actually present to hear the verdict read out at the District Court of Bandung will certainly never forget the experience and will be ever conscious that the effect of this verdict will be felt on all types of movement which at any time are aimed towards a free Indonesia.

Although Dr. Soekarno has stated in his speeches and in his writings, both at public meetings and in closed meetings, that it is not the desire of the Indonesian National Party to use weapons of force in order to acquire freedom, that the party does not wish to incite a rebellion, nonetheless the judges at the court of Bandung brought in a verdict which was not based on any evidence whatsoever to the effect that the Indonesian National Party 'possesses secret means for achieving independence', that is to say by means of violence. The fact that on the basis of suspicion such as this a court of law is able to punish defendants without the basis of any

evidence whatsoever finds no counterpart at all in the Code of Dutch Jurisprudence.

How strange this all seems if we look at it closely! In order to provide evidence in support of their accusation, it was stated earlier on that the Indonesian National Party is a party which aims at the freedom of Indonesia, that independence is bound to bring about the downfall of the existing government in Indonesia. And this downfall can only occur as a result of force.

We would now like to ask this question: is there any national party in Indonesia which is not striving for the freedom of Indonesia? No, there is none. All of them would like to see their native country free. And it would be impossible for such freedom to fail to bring about the downfall of a foreign government and the rise of self-government in our land.

If the Independence Movement is to be prohibited all the national parties in Indonesia would have to we wiped out: Boedi Oetomo, Pasumdan and the P.S.J.I. On the other hand, if the independent movements are not prohibited, it cannot be denied that subsequent independence will bring with it a change of government: the replacement of the Dutch government by an Indonesian government. In brief, this means nothing more or less than the overthrowing of the present government.

It is not possible for a man at this stage of history to determine precisely by what means the present government will fall, whether it will involve force or not, because ordinary people are not prophets who can decide what has been ordained by God for men. We are not even sure whether 'the present' government will still be in existence when the time has come for Indonesia to achieve independence. There is not one among us who is capable of predicting the way in which politics will develop in Indonesia in the time which elapses between now and the time of independence. Within government circles themselves there are certain people who are saying that Indonesia will gradually develop until it reaches the status of a dominion. We do not know when that may happen. But if it does happen and if we do gain the status of a dominion, then the present government would no longer be in existence.

You can judge for yourselves from all this how empty is the line of argument put forward in support of the verdict of the Court of Bandung, namely that the independence of Indonesia would bring about the fall of the existing government of Indonesia.

The judges in the Court of Bandung were thinking entirely in

static terms when considering the process of politics, whereas politics are by their very nature dynamic. What is completely legal and universally approved today may not be so tomorrow because times will have changed.

This is the danger which occurs when a court of law is not allowed to go into questions of politics and yet is expected to give a verdict on a case which is based purely and simply on politics. An association which is constantly changing according to the developments in the world and changing situations will be frozen in its tracks. What will happen in time to come when people start thinking of the present time and they measure up the present situation? In the eyes of the present authority, it is only the present government which will exist for ever and will never change. Consequently the decision is taken that the Indonesian National Party is planning to overthrow the present government which is legalised by the law of the land. Because of the rigid and dogmatic view taken by the court, they declare that independence can only be achieved by the overthrow of the present government. If we build up the case on axioms such as this, then any national party can be given a similar verdict. This is a fact which has to be fully noted by all the groups of people in Indonesia.

The Indonesian National Party was charged with secretly covering up the methods they propose for reaching their ideals, that is to say free Indonesia. If one wishes to descend to tricks of this kind it can also be claimed that Boedi Oetomo also hide the real way by which they intend to achieve Indonesian independence, because independence can only be attained by force. But this is not the kind of evidence for charges brought forward in this way. A court of law has no right to make comparisons of this kind, making comparisons with what may happen at sometime in the future. According to what has happened so far, Indonesian National Party, they say, has had the intent of creating a rebellion. Indeed, even more than that, according to the representative of the government itself, Dr. Kiewit de Jonge stated before the judge that the Indonesian National Party does not favour rebellion, and that its leader, Dr. Soekarno wished to suppress the information about the rebellion in the year 1930.

The question as to how later on Indonesia is to achieve her independence is not a problem which is posed to the Indonesian National Party alone, but it is a problem which faces the whole Indonesian people. When the people show that they are fully mature, they should move to achieve their own independence. This is

a truth which has been proved time and time again in the history of the world. There is no nation which has achieved freedom solely by the action of a single party. Freedom is a matter which concerns the general public as a whole. In this case it is a matter for the Indonesian people, who number some sixty million, and this freedom cannot be granted solely by one party, such as the Indonesian National Party, which only has about ten thousand members.

The job of the Indonesian National Party is none other than to rouse people's feelings for their rights, a job which is also being carried out by the other parties. They must urge people to be responsible for their own way of life and to lead their lives in the way they themselves prefer. One party alone cannot create a rebellion, even if it wished to. As the government possesses ample military equipment, it is impossible to oppose it in that manner. The mission of a party which wishes to develop a people's movement, can be nothing more than to work hard in an atmosphere of peace.

It was said on one occasion that the Indonesian National Party and the Indonesian Association were the same thing, even though they only possess organisational links. This was merely a trick in order to be able to load the case against the Indonesian National Party with the actions carried out by the Indonesian Association, which is legal in the country where it is located. But the Indonesian Association has never included force in its principles of action. In accordance with the lessons of history, the Indonesian Association has always prophesied that in the long run the oppressed people would gain their independence by force if the oppressing powers wanted to continue to run their lives and not give them their freedom. And if the Indonesian people have really achieved maturity, there will be no power on earth which will be able to withstand their will. The ball is now in the Dutch court and it is up to them to decide whether independence has to be achieved by simple matters or whether it is necessary to employ violence. This is what the Indonesian Association meant when it spoke of the means which would have to be used by Indonesia to achieve her independence. But the way in which Indonesia will finally get her freedom, no one knows. It is impossible to prophesy. Historians have stated what ought to happen, but up to now it has been to no avail. It is in the field of politics particularly that prophecies are so impossible.

And what now? It is very clear that the judge at Bandung kept on making the accusations that in the fullness of time the Indonesian National Party would resort to excessive violence. There is a Dutch

proverb which says that it is easy to get a stick when you have made up your mind to beat a dog.

But the various parties in Indonesia and all the classes of the people must declare their objection to such means. Now is the time to speak out forcefully. Your voice will be heard overseas and help will be the result. The voice from overseas will later on provide moral support for those struggling in the interests of our country. Show the world that you refuse to accept any tyranny which could only grow worse and engulf you in its shackles.

First published in *Persatuan Indonesia*, no. 75, 30th January 1931.

28 Colonial policy

From Police State to 'Judicial' State and back again to Police State

Not long ago the press of Indonesia was in a state of uproar when discussing the government's intention to issue a new order to muzzle the press. It can hardly be surprising if the entire press makes protests and raises its opposition. Because this order will narrow down the 'freedom' of the press which as it is now is already extremely narrow. An order of this kind can be used by the government as a weapon to enable it to act arbitrarily. It gives the government the authority to silence the voice of the press whenever the press is saying things which are unpleasant to its own ears, even though the voice of the press is not in fact infringing the law.

Up to now all the rules and regulations which prevent the voice of the press from disturbing the Netherlands Indies have been enshrined in the form of laws in the Code of Laws of the Netherlands Indies. This law describes in detail exactly what is forbidden. Consequently, anyone who breaks the law can be taken to court, sentenced to prison or to a fine. There is an axiom connected with the law of the land, namely that it is to be assumed that every person must know what the law is. If this is the case, then it is up to all people to observe the law and to refrain from doing whatever is prohibited by the law. On the other hand, no one can be pronounced guilty if what he has done is not in fact prohibited by the law. Every country which can be called a judicial state or a state of law, has adopted this rule.

It is true that Indonesia is not really a judicial state, but nevertheless up to now for about three-quarters of a century whatever the government decides to forbid is enshrined in a law. Earlier on there was Chapter III of the Government Regulations which forbade any political associations and meetings. This prohibition order was included in the printed version of the law. Then under Governor-General Fock the so-called 'freedom' of action and expression was narrowed down. It was no longer permissible to go on

strike nor to criticise in emphatic terms the Dutch government in Indonesia. All actions of this kind were forbidden. Nevertheless, this prohibition order is mentioned in the law. It is to be found in Chapter 161 bis and Chapters 153 bis and ter. Now recently the government has begun once again to work on the law aimed at preventing revolution. The stronger the people's movement has become, the more the government holds the view that freedom of movement and action is still too wide and must be narrowed down still further.

And yet, we repeat, right up to now the regulations which narrow down the field of activity are written within the law. Since the law has been made quite arbitrarily by the government, without the knowledge or will of the people, so that Indonesia cannot truly be called a judicial state – yet we do in fact have a law which prohibits this and forbids that. And it is still possible for anyone to find out what is prohibited and what is not.

Yet now? Now we are suddenly going to be confronted with an order which will give the government the power to forbid actions which are not prohibited by the law. The government is of the opinion that the legal regulations set out in the 'Code of Criminal Law' are not sufficiently powerful to prevent strident voices of complaint reaching the ears of the government. No matter how severe the laws of repression are which are already contained in the Code of Penal Law, the government finds that these are insufficient for their purpose. The government wishes to have complete freedom of action in preventing what the government considers is bad . . . And in order to do this the government drops the principle which is adopted in all states based on law and order and which regulate the boundaries of law and authority. In this way the government is going back to tyranny, a tyranny which knows no basis in law, back to employing police rule.

Since Government Regulation 1854 was issued, the Netherlands Indies have been referred to as a 'judicial' state – the inverted commas are our own addition –, because the authority of the government is based on 'law'. Now it has reverted once again to a police state!

This attitude on the part of the government displays to us for once the real face of the Netherlands Indies. Because never at any time have the Netherlands Indies, which have been holding Indonesia in her claws, possessed the true face of a judicial state.

A country becomes a judicial state when all actions, both in the private sector and in the public sector, are based on the rule of law.

Furthermore, law which can be regarded as real law, is law which is felt to be just and true by the public at large. This is a group which is not championed just by anybody, but none other than Prof. Krakke who has been teaching this principle since 1906. If a country is to be regarded truly as a judicial state, it must adopt the principle of democracy and must possess a parliament which is elected by the people and which considers beforehand the laws which regulate the lives of the people. Has there ever been anything of this kind in Indonesia?

That is why we are not writing judicial state, but 'judicial' state to refer to the mask which the Netherlands Indies display to the outside world. This means to say that the 'law' which is put forward as the principle of public authority is not law in its true sense which is based on a sense of justice and truth which lives in the hearts and minds of the people, but is a 'law' which has apparently been handed down from those in power.

If we look carefully and objectively at the new characteristic feature of the government, we will see that the system does not fall outside the basic principle of colonial government. It has long been part of the law of colonial psychology that whenever the government finds that its hold by a reign of law is no longer sufficient, it can turn back to the use of its glorious power so as to defend its authority. The glory of power was the very first weapon used when the native peoples had just been conquered.

Let us now have a brief look at the path followed by the colonial government.

In the very beginning Indonesia was conquered by violence and force. This means to say that according to the laws of psychology at the beginning of colonisation all resistance has to be crushed by the use of violence. The entire power of the government at that time was based solely on might. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century Indonesia was nothing more or less than a police state. In this way it was possible for the government to institute the culture system which destroyed the livelihood of the people. But this type of violence could not be allowed to proceed for ever. If it was allowed, foreign countries who also wish to lay their hands on Indonesia would later on employ the situation as a pretext for intervention. Moreover, in western Europe itself, the new spirit which desires the principle of government to change from autocracy to democracy became stronger and stronger. Finally there was the liberal revolution which took place in 1848 and which decided

firmly in favour of a democratic government based on a parliament. These movements exerted very definite effects on the way colonies were governed.

For these reasons in 1854 there was published a Government Regulation to serve as the Basic Law for Indonesia. In this way, to the outside world the Netherlands Indies appeared in terms of a 'judicial' state for from then onwards it was made to appear that all powers were based on the rule of law. But this was only true of the outward appearance. It did not hold good as regards what was really happening inside. This was because the law had been created solely by those who were governing whereas the people themselves, whose lives the law was to regulate, had absolutely no say whatsoever in the matter. As I have said earlier in this Article, the law could only become a law in the true sense of the word if it were in accord with the sense of justice and truth which lives in the heart of the people, which lives in the breast of the general public.

As it is, it is force and force alone which remains as a central basis of the government.

When we use the word 'force' here, the reader should not regard it solely in its narrow meaning of blind constraint and violence. We are using the word 'force' scientifically. Force in our sense of the word is any action which is thrust upon the people without their consent. When considered in this sense, force takes on various forms. There is armed force, repressive force, the violation of the law and there is also the overriding of the minority by the majority as against the ruling of the majority by a minority. The latter is something which we find in governments of a dictatorial nature. One also meets with this violation of the basic principles in a democratic government when the majority group establishes the rules of life which have to be obeyed by minority groups even when they conscientiously differ in their ideas about them. But this latter type of violation is normally felt to be just, because it has long been the rule in democracy that the minority must accept defeat by the majority, because the minority is free at all times to canvass their views among the populace, and both parties have equal opportunities to spread their own influence. This paragraph has merely been of the nature of an interlude to illustrate the fact that the word 'force' can permit of numerous interpretations.

It goes without saying that the force which is exerted in the 'judicial' state period which we have just mentioned is nothing like as harsh as that which was exerted during the police state era,

because it has the appearance of being based on law. It looks much more reasonable when Indonesia gets her National Council. Yes, a National Council which is not meant to act for the Indonesian people. We get much nearer the truth when we find it called the National Council of the Netherlands Indies.

So long as the people's movement proceeds slowly and continues to display its loyalty to the government, power which is founded on law is regarded as sufficient. But when the radical movement and the movement of non-cooperation emerge and people begin to show their disgust for the 'National' Council which was formed by the government, and when the people begin to declare their own meetings to be their own council, it is obvious that the power of law is no longer sufficient to keep them down. The press already knows how to use its 'freedom' to criticise whatever is wrong and to give evidence of whatever runs counter to the interest of the nation. The stronger the opposition of the people becomes, the harder it is for the government to maintain its power. With regard to the people's movement itself, recent happenings in Indonesia have shown time and time again how brutally the police can act in meetings of the people. The regulations issued by the government against the movement read more like police regulations than anything else. It must not be forgotten that the verdict of the four leaders of the Indonesian National Party – if we read it in the light of Professor Schepper's interpretation – contains all the characteristic features of a police state verdict. As regards the press, an order has now been issued which gives the government the right to use all its powers in muzzling the press.

This short description has shown how Indonesia developed from a police state to a 'judicial' state and then from a 'judicial' state back to the condition of a police state. Heaven alone knows what more police-type regulations are to be thrust upon our movement.

These regulations can only be opposed by our remaining firm and standing up for our rights as a people and our right to own Indonesia as a true judicial state.

First published in *Daulat Rakjat*, no. 1, 20th September 1931.

29 The fight for the freedom of the press

'The freedom of the press is one of the bulwarks of freedom and can only be extinguished by a tyrannical government.'

These are the words of Chapter 12 of the 'Declaration of Rights' which constituted the basic law used in the State of Virginia, part of the United States of America, when these states were fighting for their freedom.

What this statement really means is that the freedom of the press is the genuine right of the people, a right which must not be destroyed or wasted.

During the great revolution in France in 1789, the old ways of life known as *ancien régime* crumbled away and the seeds of democracy were planted, seeds which in due course became the very source of western life of the present day, when the freedom of the press is acknowledged and recognised as one of the fundamental rights of the people, a right which is powerful and durable. It is a right which has been set out in the 'Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen'.

When the French republic established its constitution in the year 1791, this right was set out in the constitution thus: 'The freedom to exchange opinions and feelings constitutes one of the highest human rights; every inhabitant in the country is free to speak, to write and to publish, in keeping with his responsibilities under the law. The Constitution guarantees as a strong civil right the freedom of any person to speak, write, publish and explain his thoughts and at the same time it is not necessary for whatever he has written to be subjected first of all to examination by those in power.

Many of the rights which were regarded as powerful and eternal during the times of the great revolution are now in disuse. But the freedom of the press has been regarded right up to now as a pure unassailable right in every democratic country. The Constitution of the Belgian monarchy states in Chapter 18: 'The press is free;

censorship must not be adopted; it is not permissible to ask for guarantee money from writers, publishers and printers. If the writer is known and lives in Belgium, the publisher, the printer and the bookseller are released from responsibility.'

Here it can clearly be seen that the right of free speech is fully recognised as an essential feature of the life of the people. John Stewart Mill was a well-known social scientist of the last century, wrote that public opinion can only be developed if there is a press everywhere to inform that opinion. He also went on to say that the organisation of a country is insufficient if there is no press to counter-balance the government. And when at this time Professor Kranenburg, a famous jurist in the Netherlands, talked about the press, he said that the freedom of the press is one of the pure rights of man which is extremely important, indeed it is the most important after freedom of belief. He regarded the press as an instrument to inform and unite the opinion of the common people. He went on to say that the freedom of the press depends in the main on the strength of public opinion.

It is the strength of public opinion, the power of the will of the people, which has become the basis of the freedom of the Press. The Netherlands is well known as a country which strongly upholds the freedom of speech and is greatly in support of the freedom of the Press.

Is this situation brought about by the Constitution of the Netherlands, which guarantees the freedom of speech and press clearly, as does the Constitution of Belgium? No, this is not so. The Constitution of Belgium provides a much wider freedom. Chapter 7 of the Netherlands Constitution states that 'people do not require to ask permission in order to be able to express their thoughts in the press, apart from the need to fulfil their responsibilities in accordance with the law'.

From this it can be seen that freedom of the Press exists and is recognised, but there is the law which can be regarded as a restriction to the breadth of freedom granted. If those in power make the law repressive, then they may promulgate laws which can narrow the 'freedom' of the Press. In the end this can mean that whatever has been given by the left hand can be taken back again by the right. According to its actual wording, Chapter 7 of the Constitution of the Netherlands does not guarantee that the principle of the freedom of the Press cannot be restricted later on. It is true that censorship is prohibited (according to Chapter 7), but a reactionary Government can narrow down the freedom of the Press by adopting

a number of tricks which outwardly do not look as though they oppose the basic spirit of the Constitution.

But the guarantee of the freedom of the Press does not arise from provisions in the Constitution. The guarantee arises from the conviction of the will of the people. The freedom of the Press is so great in the Netherlands because the people of that country truly value this freedom and hate censorship. Prof. Kranenburg says that since the birth of freedom in their country in the year 1581 the Dutch people have never given much thought to the administration of the Monarchy. The political right to which they have given the greatest attention is the right of free speech or debate in public, the freedom to express whatever they may feel, and this right has always been available to them. There has never been any government of the Netherlands, either during the period of the Republic or during the present period, which has been bold enough to try to narrow down the freedom of the Press or bridle the mouth of the people. The freedom of the Press has become something which is highly treasured by the Dutch people, it has become part of their way of life. Consequently Chapter 7 of the Dutch Constitution is nothing more than a guarantee to express the wishes of the people. Consequently this freedom is one which cannot be interpreted on the basis of the wording of the Constitution alone, but something which needs to be interpreted in accordance with the spirit which is based on the very conviction of the people themselves.

This shows us very clearly what the freedom of the Press should be like and how the power of the will of the people can be strong. But what is the position in Indonesia? Chapter 164 of the 'Law of the State of Netherlands Indies' states that 'the manner in which the Government protects the Press is regulated by an ordinance'.

Anyone who examines this sentence will be aware of the fact that the Press Ordinance which has been recently published by the Government does not run counter to the principle of government set out by the Colonial Government. In this connection I would also ask you to read my article in *Daulat Rakjat*, no. 1.

In this way we can see the different attitudes taken by those in power when they are considering the Press in a free country and that in a colonised country. In the Netherlands the freedom of the Press is acknowledged in the Constitution as something which is in accordance with the conviction and will of the people. If there is to be any limit set on this freedom, then this limit has to be determined by a statutory act of Parliament and the Government. As we have

already explained, it is not easy for those in power to restrict the freedom of the Press because it is something which is regarded as a genuine basic right of the people.

In Indonesia it is possible for the Government to decide how it likes to deal with the Press. It is possible to regulate the law quite independently of the will of the people; all that is necessary is an Ordinance! Has this state of affairs been brought about by the fact that the freedom of the Press is not regarded as one of the genuine rights of the people? No! In Indonesian everyday life it is also regarded as a basic right of the people. According to the old law of custom, it is based on two strong foundations: the right of meeting, where the representatives of the people can confer and reach agreement, and the right of the people to protest in public.

Even during the reigns of the most tyrannical kings the right of the people to protest against regulations which were regarded as unjust by holding public meetings was not denied to the people. From this it can be seen that the right of protest by public meeting is also regarded by the Indonesian people as a part of their treasured heritage. The freedom of the Press is only one form that particular right can take. The form which matters most will take on a guise according to the place and the time. Nowadays it is the Press which is the most common means for public opinion to be expressed. Therefore the freedom of the Press is clearly in accordance with the law of custom in Indonesia.

But since Indonesia has been ruled by the Dutch the freedom of the Press has been gradually whittled down. During the drawing up of the first Government Regulations in the States General in the year 1854, there was only one voice to be heard which defended the freedom of the Press for Indonesia, and this was the voice of Mr. Thorbecke. He said that if every hardship which was felt by the people of Indonesia were to appear in the newspapers, this would give the Government an opportunity to examine these hardships in a just and proper manner. If there was no freedom of expression, all these hardships would be pent up in the hearts and minds of the people and this in the end would constitute a danger to public welfare. But the Government and the majority group in the States General had a different view. In paragraph 7 of the Memorandum of Instruction and the Draft Constitution it stated that it was not necessary to give the people of Indonesia freedom of expression, because this freedom would mean the right to criticise freely any regulation which is not favoured by the people and the putting

forward of requests as to how the regulations should be altered. It was said that a freedom of this kind would weaken the respect and loyalty of the people towards the Government. This condition, they said, would jeopardise the Netherlands Indies.

In other words, the basic principles of colonial government were based on the idea that a colony is something which is useful to the oppressor. Consequently the genuine rights of the people are not to be recognised. The freedom of the Press, which is in accordance with the wish and convictions of the people, is excluded or suppressed. What is held to be good for oneself cannot be applied to the foreign people one is governing. There was an Englishman who expressed very wisely the attitude of the Dutch. He said 'In matters of commerce, the fault of the Dutch is giving too little and asking too much'.

When this idea is transferred into the field of colonial policy, this attitude is one which seeks only the pleasures and profits for oneself but never cares about the rights of foreigners. There is plenty of evidence to be found for this attitude in the history of Dutch colonial policy.

But even though the basic rights of the people are crushed by the Government, they still remain the treasure of their heritage in the hearts of the people. If the Indonesian Press wishes to be regarded as the means for the expression of public opinion or public feeling, it is the bounden duty of the Press to keep on fighting for this right. It is only the political dailies which should carry on this fight, but every Indonesian journal, especially those which use the national seal. Every effort must be taken in every possible direction to ensure that we receive back complete freedom of the Press. The very first objective in all this has to be that the Press Ordinance was recently promulgated must be set aside.

The way which has to be taken by the Indonesian Press to achieve this goal is no different from that used by the Press of the Western World to attain the same freedom. This is by carrying out activities regularly, keeping up the struggle with an honest heart, without any sign of retreat even when faced with difficulties. They must all remain loyal and united and must help one another in this particular matter, however great the differences may be between them in regard to other subjects. In this case the common action has to be carried on without any feeling of despair; any colleagues who have fallen must be helped. If the Indonesian Press fights properly and regularly and shows sufficient moral fibre, then by the Grace of God they will

achieve their right of freedom of the Press in no time. In this way the Press will come to be recognised as a representative of the public and as a defender of public opinion in Indonesia. Rights and Justice cannot be achieved by merely raising one's hands to Heaven or by begging, they can only be achieved by fighting – these were the words of Von Jhering, who was a great expert in law.

The same applies to the freedom of the Press. This can only be achieved by the efforts of our own Press itself.

Now Indonesia already has its own Association of Journalists. The path to the attainment of the freedom of the Press is not via the 'National Council' in Pedjambon, but via the actual work of the newspapers themselves. The newspapers themselves constitute the battlefield where Indonesian journalists have to fight.

Is it necessary for the Indonesian Association to form a single common newspaper?

I would say not. The power of the Indonesian Press fighting for the freedom of the Press would be much stronger and much fuller in meaning if this voice were to be found expressed in all newspapers and not only in one. The purpose of the Indonesian Press Association is to act as a forum for consultation, as a place where one can arrange the form the common action is to take, and once that has been decided, the way it is to be put into effect is the duty of each individual newspaper.

Action of this kind will also strengthen the spirit of the people of Indonesia. The spirit of the people alone, provided it is strong, can destroy any tyranny and can force the Government to comply with its demands.

First published in *Daulat Rakjat*, no. 8, 30th November 1931.

30 The principles of the Hitler dictatorship in Germany

After the World War of 1914-1918 there were many people throughout the world who were thinking how cruel wars were and how they destroyed civilisation and how much there was to be gained for the people of the world in the progress of democracy. The meaning of the word democracy is government by the people. At the present time democracy takes the form of the representation of the people in government councils.

Everywhere around us we can see the fall of monarchies. In Russia, the famous Czarist empire has been destroyed by the bolshevik revolution. In Germany the empire of the Hohenzollerns, based on history and the royal prerogative has been replaced by a republic which is controlled by the Social Democrats. The same sort of thing has happened to the Hapsburg monarchy in Central Europe and to the Sultanate in Turkey. All the royal crowns have been washed away. Authority has been transferred from the monarch to the people. Things which seemed unthinkable in the past have come to pass. It was possible for Ebert, originally a shoemaker, to become a president of Germany – whereas in the past the position of Head of State could only be held by a member of a royal family. It has just been like having the world turned upside down. Whereas in the past the centre of the stage was held by the monarch and aristocratic authorities, now it is the battle for democracy. The Social Democrats, who in the past were the people who were hounded from place to place, have now become he masters of the country and they represent Germany at international conferences.

But that was not all! Over the grave of the Emperor Mars (the God of War) at Versailles there was born a great international council, the League of Nations, with its Supreme Court, the International High Court of Justice.

It was not surprising, therefore, if western pacifists at that time were proudly saying 'now the war is over, we can see the full blos-

som time of democracy'. The influence of ordinary people was greater in both national and international affairs. Social legislation would be expanded. At least, these were the promises made by the government. The constitution must be based on general franchise. At last the whole concept of democracy was going to achieve its final success. The seed which was sown during the French revolution in 1789 had grown and borne fruit and it was now possible for the people to eat the fruit. Nobody at that time could think that the ripe fruit, if they did not take care, would fall on the ground and get in the mud. In this way their pride and succes could induce people to forget the danger which was theatening them but which was still not apparent.

Not long after the war, the wind turned and started to blow in the opposite direction. The hurricane of reaction blew back and confused the political scene in Europe. Reaction first made its appearance in Italy when it opposed the democracy which was unable to rule there and to keep order. The democrats, broken and confused, were attacked by the fascists who possessed a united discipline and ideas issued by one person. In the year 1922 Mussolini started the fascist revolution by marching on Rome. Three hundred thousand Blackshirts marched down from Milan to Rome to fight for power. The government was afraid to fight because it did not enjoy the support of the King. It was the King who handed the power to Mussolini. From that time onwards democracy has been abolished in Italy. The country has been ruled on the basis of dictatorship.

The fascist dictatorship in Italy has been copied by other countries, especially countries where there is a state of confusion arising from political rivalry and where the middle classes regard democracy as an obstacle to their prosperity.

First of all Yugoslavia created a dictatorship in the person of her King, King Alexander, because of the struggle which was taking place between the cld Serbians and the Croations. This struggle was taking place not only in the streets but also in the parliament building itself. In that country politics were not only fought out by political means, but in the Balkan style. What could not be solved by discussion would be solved by the dagger and pistol.

From there the spirit of Fascism spread to Poland, Hungary, Austria and finally to Germany. The amount of space available to me now is insufficient for me to explain how it was that fascism

was able to progress in Germany. For our purposes it will be sufficient to say that the spirit of fascism and dictatorship grew stronger throughout Europe and we can truly say that we are now living in the age of dictators.

The development of fascism in Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria and other countries was not sensational. But the success in Fascism in Germany, taking the form of the rise of the Nazis to authority, caused a sensation throughout the whole world. Germany, which had been proud to be the battlefield of democracy – these are the words of the Social Democrat Groups themselves – had now turned right round and become the centre of autocratic rule. Democracy, which is not yet 15 years old in that country, has now been destroyed by Hitler's dictatorship. This constitutes a major attack on Western democracy. There are many people who think that the age of democracy has now ended. There are now many people who feel that they have the choice between a Bolshevik dictatorship and a fascist dictatorship.

I said a little while ago that the rise of Nazi dictatorship in Germany made a great sensation throughout the entire world. Many people were surprised to see the great strides made by national socialism (which is not really socialism) in Germany. Many of them are asking 'Why is it that a highly civilised country like Germany, which is known to include the highest scientific brains and thinkers, can be so easily influenced by Hitler who just shouts slogans and exerts a demagogic influence?' Surely his speeches, which are empty of real content and which are not well constructed from the point of view of composition, could not possibly attract the attention of the educated German reader, who is usually more inclined to read detailed and systematic analyses.

Nevertheless, more than 90% of Germans have been seduced by Hitler. The referendum which has just been carried out shows that 40 million out of 43 million have cast their votes for Hitler, including millions of former communists and social democrats. Has the German world become a lunatic asylum? How is it possible for a highly intelligent and thoughtful nation to be ruled by a person who can only offer slogans and demagogy?

It is true that since the World War Germany almost did become a madhouse. The embryo of democracy which was grown by the Weimar coalition (The Social Democrat party, the Democrat party and the Catholic party) could not achieve full development. Misery and misfortune made people confused.

From the peace conference following the war until the year 1924 Germany experienced continuous inflation. First of all the value of the money of Germany fell to one-sixth of what it was. This was in the year 1919. At that time most people thought that it would be impossible for the value of money to fall any further. In fact there were many people who thought that the Mark would rise again and so they were speculating on this rise. But the very opposite happened. At the beginning of 1922 the value of the Mark had fallen to become equivalent to one Dutch cent, that is to say one-sixtieth of its original value. After the murder of Rathenau by the German nationalists in the middle of that year, the value of the Mark fell extremely rapidly. Then the French occupied the Ruhr area with a view to forcing Germany to pay her war debts. This meant an even greater rate in the progress of inflation. People now had to talk in terms of millions and billions of Marks. For example 1 Dutch florin, which in the past was worth 1.66 Marks, at that time had a value of 1,000,000 Marks.

What was the outcome of all this? It was to ruin the lives of salaried persons and wage earners and to destroy the lives of persons whose property had become valueless. The middle class group became weaker and it became possible for the great capitalists to oppress the poor labourers still further. Anyone who went to Germany during those years or read books or newspapers telling them of conditions applying there can describe the misery and wretchedness of their time. Naturally people became confused and anxious.

If the Germans had not been humiliatèd by the French at the Versailles Peace Conference, of course this would have strengthened the proletarian movement there and Germany would not have been conquered by a Nazi dictator. Everything the French have done since the time of the Versailles Peace Conference has strengthened the nationalist spirit of Germany which in turn was the route to Hitler dictatorship.

Time and time again the French failed to make any positive contribution to the problem of Germany. The actions of the French were always aimed at injuring the German people. Her political aims were at all times to humiliate their defeated enemy. This was a scene which was started by Clemenceau, who certainly earned his nickname of the 'Tiger' at the Peace Conference of Versailles. The Germans were invited not to take part in the Peace Conference, but to receive their punishment meted out to them. The German delegation was not given an opportunity to speak. It is true that

Lloyd George said sometime afterwards that the French were brave and calm in defeat but cruel in victory. Frenchmen base their actions on sentiments and emotions and are not rational like Englishmen. For many years they had suffered from the German attack and when finally they won the war they were unable to control their feelings of revenge. By every means possible then it was necessary to humiliate the Germans. They regarded the Germans as barbarians. They called him *Boche* in French.

Now let us take a brief look at the Versailles Peace Conference, which was the cause of the great humiliation of the German people. First of all it was decided in the treaty that Germany was to be given the blame for the creation of the World War. In the second place, her territory was to be divided up and controlled by the Victorious allied countries. In the third place she must be forced to pay reparations, amounting to about 132 thousand million. The interest on this debt was to be 5% per annum, which amounted to more than 6,500 millions. It was impossible for the Germans to pay the interest, let alone the debt itself. This meant that Germany would be a debtor to the allied countries for ever. The debt just grew larger and larger, as the unpaid interest was added to it, together with the interest on the interest. Fourthly as security for the payment for the debt, certain parts of Germany were occupied by France and other powers. Fifthly, Germany was not allowed to attend the Versailles Peace Conference because Germany had come to be regarded as an uncivilised country. In spite of this, the League of Nations was called into being as a league aimed at developing world peace.

It is quite obvious that everything possible had been done to humiliate the Germans. But the proverb says that 'Whoever sows the wind, shall reap the hurricane'. The French wished to humiliate and oppress the Germans for ever. But by adopting this policy the French were really causing the nationalistic spirit of Germany to flourish, and German nationalism did in fact increase extremely rapidly. The German government itself, which had based its policy on international peace, was unable to stand up against the progress of the spirit of nationalism. The German people were in opposition to their government, the democratic and pacifist groups were continuously losing in the elections in Germany. The low level of life to which they had fallen was used by Hitler to win their support when he cried out for the creation of a Third Reich in which the nation would regain its self-esteem.

His great influence on the people of Germany was shown at the

elections for the Reichstag in 1929. Until that time the Nazi party had only 12 representatives in parliament. But as a result of the election in that year the Nazi party had 107 representatives in parliament. This was truly an extraordinary success. In the elections which followed, the success of Hitler increased even more rapidly. In the end, Hitler obtained for himself dominion over the whole of Germany and the first thing he did was to destroy all parties which were based on democratic ideas. There were to be no political parties in Germany apart from the Nazi party. As a result of this Hitler now ruled the country without opposition. His followers always worked hard to create the belief in the people that he was the Führer (leader) destined to create once again the greatness of Germany and win back the nation's self-esteem.

One question which is on everybody's lips is why it should have been so easy for Hitler to come to power. 'Why is it that the Germans who hate Hitler and his movement did not fight against him, because we know that the Germans are a highly organised nation? A party like the German Social Democratic Party, with its good organisation and strong discipline, was destroyed so easily by Hitler. Is not this a surprising fact?'

Many people were asking questions of this kind. There were many people who had thought that if the Nazis came to power, civil war would certainly break out in Germany. They felt sure that the communists would make a serious attack, because they knew that they would be oppressed by Hitler. Even the Social Democrat group had felt certain that if the Nazis came to power, civil war would be the result. The political parties and the trade unions would have to be immobilised in order to prevent Hitler from taking power. They knew from the past that they were capable of creating a general strike at once throughout the whole of Germany.

But what really happened when all came to all? In the first place there was no civil war. All trade unions were dissolved without any opposition. Of course, there were many people who were surprised to see how this worked out.

How could it all happen in this way? There are problems which it is necessary to discuss very seriously with a view to discovering all the basic reasons, so that we can learn an important political lesson from them.

The German people are known as a people who understand and value discipline. It may well be that this very discipline itself, which in the past has been the main force of the organisation of the

proletariat there, had now become the reason why they could not rise up in their own defence. Because of their natural acceptance of discipline, it was an easy matter to get the German people to obey a ruler. Even in the Social Democrat party, and in the trade unions the leaders had always exercised great authority. Most of the members of these associations were accustomed to receiving orders and to agreeing to the decisions made by their leaders. Moreover, many of these organisations were not founded on democratic principles. In view of these habits of behaviour it was very easy for a leader to enjoy unchallenged authority, if he but knew how to use the iron hand. When Hitler received the power through von Papen and President Hindenburg, people who were used to obeying authority found it easy and automatic to obey the new ruler. That is why Hitler came to power so easily.

In point of fact the German people have never known democracy. As we can see from their history, there was no German kingdom but just a looose association of cities and a number of nomadic tribes. When the state first began to make its appearance in the Middle Ages as an association of tribes, there was no permanent union based on a given territory (Jellinek, *Allgemeine Staatslehre*, pp. 317 and 318). Therefore there was no place which could be regarded as a natural centre of authority or as the capital of the country. In this way it was very different from the Roman Empire where all the territories were ruled from one place, the capital.

In these circumstances, the power to rule the group of nations and the life of the group could be held by one person who was elected by the people. If there was no king, Jellinek says, and if the individual powers were not held together in 'one hand', the German nation could be broken because it became a lot of small individual regions without power. This was the natural disintegration which would occur in the absence of any central control. According to Jellinek, the state government and administration (Staatsrecht) in Germany during the last century was such that the Germans needed a monarchy. This was the main reason why an absolute monarch came to power in Germany. In actual fact in the 17th century the Emperor compulsorily divided up the Empire into a number of kingdoms who were each responsible to him. Each of these kings had his own country so that the people throughout the entire Empire developed different ways of life and had different laws (Krabbe, 'Constitutionele Monarchie', in *Staatsrechtelijke Opstellen*, p. 134).

The French revolution in 1789 brought about a great change in western Europe in the relationship between the king and the people. Feudal society and the absolute power of the monarch had been destroyed and turned into democracy, government of the people by the people. Even if a republic was not created, at least they had a constitutional monarchy, that is to say a rule by the king in association with the people. In practice this was parliament. And the power of the people in parliament became greater. In the last resort the king was only left as a symbol of the nation.

But history did not move in the same way in Germany! There, since the creation of the 'Deutscher Bund' in 1815, there was only one type of government which could be referred to as restricted monarchy. In other words, the king had powers of his own and these were absolute. The limitation or restriction of his authority was to be found in the constitutional law. Before the World War in 1914-1918 the 'Reichstag' was given by the Emperor to his people, but it was not a true parliament and in fact it was something of the same kind as the People's Council at Pedjambon, Batavia.

At the end of the World War, the power of the monarch disappeared completely in Germany. But its spirit still lived on. The revolution which threw out Kaiser Wilhelm and built the Republic of Germany only went half way. That is why democracy did not develop satisfactorily there. The first mistake which they made was that of giving too great an authority and too powerful a position to the president. As Professor Krabbe wrote in his article on Modern State Government (*De Gids*, 1920), the German constitution was much more like a monarchy than a republic. The president, who was elected directly by the people with a vote of more than 50%, received his authority from the people. And if the elected president had a strong personality he would not be satisfied with avoiding politics and the result is that he would be liable to oppose the parliament and operate according to his own political judgement, saying that he had received all this as a mandate from the people.

Just what Professor Krabbe described for the past, could also happen in the future. When the Reichstag proved unable to carry out the functions of government because of political disintegration and because there was no group which held a majority vote, President Hindenburg merely carried out his own Policies. The last of these, was opening the door to Hitler's dictatorship.

The democracy which was experienced by the German people was not true democracy. The responsibility for this rested mainly

with the Social Democrat Party who constituted the Bourgeoise Republic of that time. They failed to educate the people into the ideas of real democracy. They merely re-created the spirit of monarchy. The reason why dictatorship has flourished in Germany is that it has come to a country in which, as we have described above, people were never given the opportunity of deciding upon their own life and future. Democracy in that country had a very long way to go before it could have been called anything like true democracy.

Even though the Nazi dictatorship has its 'foundations in the spirit of the German nation', it will not be the last form of government administration in Germany. Throughout history we have found that dictators have only occurred for temporary periods. Whenever there are riots and disintegration of society, it is then that dictatorship – the authority of one person or of a small group of persons – makes its appearance. The confusion and disintegration which occurred during the middle ages opened up the way to monarchism. When the country had been peaceful and orderly for some time, absolute royal power ceased to exist. As the Dutch proverb says, 'Its mission was completed'. Since that time dictatorships have only been regarded as an evil by people and people always return to demand their original rights, their right to decide their own future. The French Revolution was one stage in the movement of people to attain their aims. When we study history we can see that the position of a king has fallen from that of an absolute power to becoming a mere symbol of the country. The path of history of government from autocracy to true rule by the people cannot be cut off permanently. It can only be cut off for a time. This is because democracy is based on the intrinsic birthright of a people, namely the people's right to ascertain what its own future will be.

First published in *Daulat Rakjat*, no. 83, 30th December, 1933.

31 The inheritance of Versailles

Anyone who wishes to celebrate the twenty-year anniversary of the Versailles Peace Conference on the 28th July next will know what it is to be forced to eat bitter fruit. It certainly will not be peace which will be celebrated. The Versailles Conference has been buried and all efforts to build the foundations of eternal peace have been in vain.

As I stated in my book *Mentjari Volkenbond dari abad keabad* (Looking for the League of Nations from Century to Century), the Versailles Conference was based on the spirit of war itself, the spirit which is aimed at destroying the enemy for ever.

How far Versailles fell short of the words of Wilson who said that peace was based on 'the rights of every nation to decide its own lot'! The right of self-determination has become the anthem of all nations throughout the world, even though Wilson really only suggested it for application to Europe. The countries that have been colonised are also thinking in terms of the way being open for their own self-determination. To some of the colonised people, self-determination was clearly promised. For example, some Arabs were promised independence if they would assist the Allies in fighting their overlords, the Turks. Others of them were given the hope of the so-called 'November promise'.

The application of Wilson's ideas to colonial countries is based on Chapter 22 of the The League of Nations Conference. This lays down that the aim is to provide prosperity and progress to nations who are still unable to stand for themselves in the difficult conditions of the new world. Some nations who have become the carriers of civilisation have been given the power to carry out this 'sacred mission'. These countries are to be responsible to the League of Nations for carrying out their mission. They are not to be countries who are owning other countries and exerting authority over them, but they will be nothing more than countries who have received a

mandate. Our new system was born, namely the mandate system. No country with a mandate can be granted power over another country as a colony, it will only be the League of Nations itself which will have colonies. It was felt that the mandate structure would have a profound influence and in fact reorganise the old system of colonies. There was a hope that all nations could really become 'one family of nations' living together in prosperity and happiness.

But what has happened in actual fact? The late Professor Struycken, the famous legal specialist from the Netherlands, who was the principal member of the delegation to the League of Nations, said that 'there was no basis in Chapter 22 which was in accord with the ideas of the League of Nations, but which merely served to cover up worse situations'. In point of fact it is true that the worst possible situations are contained in Chapter 22, covered up in a blanket of good words. It is rather like having mud wrapped up with gold! Ordinary people have said, just like Struycken, that Chapter 22 is full of deceit. Immanuel Kant will turn in his grave and cry out that the agreement reached at the Conference of The League of Nations, as set out in Chapter 22, hides its true aims and therefore the Conference does not deserve the title of Peace Conference.

In point of fact, when we say that the colonised countries have been given the great boon of the 'sacred mission', this does not hold good for all colonised countries, but only to the former colonies of Germany and Turkey who lost the World War. And the countries which are to hold the mandates are in fact the allied countries who won the war. The great bulk of the colonised countries involved in the 'sacred mission' are in fact acquired by Britain and France. Surely this means nothing more nor less than the simple transfer of the colonised countries from the defeated countries to the countries who won the war.

If the decisions of the League of Nations were to be made universal from the very beginning, so that they applied not only to the colonies which belonged previously to the countries defeated in the War, but so that all colonised countries could be converted into mandated territories, subject to the power and authorisation of all the members of the League of Nations, then maybe the basic idea of a 'sacred mission' could bear valuable fruit. In the end this could mean the achievement of peace in the world and the disappearance of colonical problems.

What is happening now? Because the wish to regard colonies as

property to be owned has grown stronger and stronger, both inside and outside the League of Nations, the problem of colonies has become even greater. Not only is it a problem when Germany threatens to ask for the return of her old colonies, but new problems are constantly arising in the other colonies and semi-colonial countries. We are now witnessing struggles between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' to fight for the right to possess colonies. It is quite possible that these will be the very problems which will cause the next war. The idea that colonies should in the end acquire their own rights has almost disappeared from the face of the earth.

This is how the Treaty of Versailles manipulated the question concerned with the rights of a nation to self-determination. The mess it has made in handling this problem will in the end lead to harm to the institution itself.

It is a very curious thought that the very principle which Wilson laid down in his slogan 'The right of every nation to self-determination' should have been ruled out for countries which have been colonised, that is to say countries which are in greatest need of it.

We are fully aware of the fact that before the war of 1914-1918 Europe contained many problems of nationalism. In particular it was the Slav nations which presented problems in Europe, ranging from Russia right throught central Europe and down into southern Europe. Only some of these nations had achieved independence. The greatest of these was Russia which constituted its own kingdom. There were three smaller independent countries of thc Slav nations. But the greater part of the Slav countries, such as Poland, Croatia, Moravia, Slovakia and Ruthenia were ruled by the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The countries which were overruled had a population of 51 million souls, whilst the countries ruling them, Germany and Hungary, had 20 million. Of these there were about 9 million Germans and 10 million Magyars. It is not surprising if Rudolf Kjellen, a specialist in world politics, called the Austro-Hungarian Empire a hypothetical nation, especially from the point of view of the Slavonic nations. This was the cause of the conflict between Austro-Hungary and Russia, who suggested the pan-Slav movement. In Bohemia, the pan-Slav movement was engaged in a struggle with the pan-German movement. On the basis of this pan-Slav movement, Russia came to regard herself as the protector of the Slav nations living down in the Balkans, like Serbia and Montenegro. She gave the cry of 'Servia Irredenta' stating that the demand by Serbia to get back their country from the Austro-Hungar-

ian Empire, was supported by Russia. We also know that Italy also had problems of 'irredenta' areas with other nations. She was not satisfied until she obtained Trento, Trieste and one of the ports of Dalmatia.

The same sort of thing happened with Rumania. In every region in central Europe there were problems arising from national aspirations and the claims of foreign countries. If it had been said in the past that Turkey was the sick man of Europe, then Austria-Hungary was a sick man of Europe who was on the point of death.

We know that the events of Sarajevo caused the first demands to be made of the League of Nations. The duty of Versailles was to distribute the lands to the countries who had been concerned in the treaties of St. Germain, Neuilly, Trianon and Sèvres. But how was this distribution carried out. Did they do it on the basis of the precept put forward by Wilson, that is that the nations should have the right to self-determination?

No it did not happen this way at all. At Versailles Wilson was replaced by Clemenceau, the tiger. His desire was merely to continue the war into the field of politics. This is merely the converse of the opinion put forward by Clausewitz in 1833, when he said that war was a continuation of politics, but by using different means. But to Clemenceau politics was merely another way of continuing the war and another way in which the enemy could be subjected to complete and absolute destruction. However, since a nation of about 70 million people cannot be made to vanish into thin air, the destruction of the nation must be carried out by reducing it to a state of permanent weakness. The security of France needed a weak Germany at its side. It comes as a surprise first of all to find that Lloyd George merely followed him, but this was because the politics of Clemenceau, just like British politics, were based on the balance of power. Many years later, when Lloyd George was aware of what he had done together with the others at Versailles, he regarded it as a mistake on the part of the French. He said that the French possess wisdom when they are defeated but are fiery devils when they win.

It is quite obvious that in the carve-up of Versailles the Germans had no right of self-determination. It was not possible for Austria, which has a German population, to be re-united with Germany. Some regions which contained a German population were given to other countries created after the World War. Germany was divided into two parts, namely Greater Germany itself and East Prussia near the Polish border. A new controversy was started by the way

in which the population of Danzig and Memel were treated, which were both German cities with an average German population. These were made into independent cities under the direct protection of the League of Nations. In actual practice they became protectorates of Poland. Poland was given the corridor region, but because it had no ports she was anxious to get hold of Danzig to serve as her great harbour. The same sort of thing happened to Memel under the protectorate of Lithuania.

It goes without saying that the decisions of Versailles cannot possibly last for ever. Versailles, which drew a new map of Europe, had not learned the lessons of past history. The previous century had been a century of danger because of pan-Slavism which demanded the liberation of Slav countries. One of the purposes of the World War was to liberate all the 'Irredenta' areas, but now in the new treaty new Irredenta areas were created. Now there had come into being 'German Irredenta' followed by 'Magyar Irredenta'. In fact Irredentist regions were created in two of the active nations who had called themselves *Herrenvolk*. Furthermore it must always be remembered that the Germans are a dynamic people. They are a people always anxious to face their problems. They are a nation who never take anything lying down, especially if their sense of honour has been humiliated. Therefore the decisions of Versailles could only bring about new sentiments of nationalism. The Germans and the Magyars constantly make demands over the new Slav countries which have come into being and over the Kingdom of Rumania, claiming that these are the outposts of Slav imperialism, at a time when Tsarism of Russia, which protected the other Slav countries, has disappeared. Its successor, Soviet Russia, does not carry on the spirit handed down from Tsarism, because her aims oppose those of her sister Slav countries. In all this it is France which is the great supporter of Rumania.

And it is here that we get a very odd change-round in the positions of the countries. Before the war it was the French who constantly opposed Austria-Hungary, while Germany protected the Empire. The Austro-Hungarian Empire was regarded by the Germans as the bulwark against the pan-Slav movement in the south. Now after the war it is the French who take up what was previously the German position. Germany becomes the country which is constantly having to demand the rights of her own nationhood.

As a result of this it is pan-Germanism which becomes very active whilst the pan-Slav groups are on the defence. In the early stages

Germany was weak, being shackled by the Treaty of Versailles. But despite this, her demands still constitute a great danger to peace. Germans who are living in other countries are constantly demanding their rights, which means that they are not making those other countries stronger but increasingly weaker. Therefore it can only be a matter of time before they regain some of their rights.

Perhaps those who are responsible for the decisions which were made at Versailles thought that any injustices which had occurred could be changed later on. Therefore in the Charter of the League of Nations, Chapter 19, there are rules relating to the alteration of agreements which cannot be put into practice and which constitute a danger to peace. One such danger is to be found in the frontiers which were laid down at the Treaty of Versailles. These details were not written out in full but were said to be capable of consideration. But one thing which was forgotten was that it is extremely difficult for the frontiers of a country to be altered by peaceful means. Consequently Chapter 19 of the Versailles Treaty (the establishment of the League of Nations) is meaningless. The great mistake, in fact the greatest mistake of all, was that the peace decisions which had to be controlled and put into effect by the League of Nations were not built on the real foundation of peace. In other words the agreements which were made at Versailles were only the agreements made between the victor countries, not agreements made between the two groups of countries, namely the vanquished and the victors. That is why this treaty will in the end have to be changed.

But the unfortunate thing is that every change which has taken place in the agreements of Versailles was carried out not by peaceful means but by means of force. The first show of force came from Turkey. She destroyed the Sèvres agreements by force. In the end her actions were approved by the Allies. As a result of this many people thought that Turkey was the only country which had really won anything from the war. All these instances strengthened the nationalistic spirit of the German people. After the war there appeared a new line of thought in Germany, a line of thought which was likely to bring peace. In brief, this was the spirit of German democracy. This good trend, which was one which was capable of creating peaceful conditions in central Europe, had been resisted by France and her companions by many prohibitive regulations. For this reason, the nationalistic spirit came into opposition with the German democratic way of thinking. This nationalism developed

rapidly under the leadership of Hitler with his Nazi movement. If the democratic group in Germany had been supported by France, they would have proved stronger than the Nazi movement. In the end, Hitler and the Nazis took control of Germany.

When the democratic parties were in power in Germany, every freedom which the Germans asked for was opposed on the basis of the Versailles Treaty. But the Nazis did not ask, they took their rights by force. They strengthened their army without the permission of the Versailles powers. The old Ally countries were angry but they did not take any action. All the time Hitler continued to have his own way in Germany. He re-militarised the Rhine, something which was expressly prohibited by the Treaty of Versailles. France and Britain did not resist the action of Hitler, but restricted themselves to protesting. Hitler went on stage by stage and now he has annexed Austria. The Sudetenland was annexed by Hitler with the assistance of Britain and France, both of whom seemed to enjoy obeying Hitler's wishes. After this, Czechoslovakia, whose independence had been guaranteed by the French and the British at Munich, was wiped off the face of the earth and was distributed between Germany and Hungary. The strong democratic group in Czechoslovakia has been replaced by Nazis. Then Germany received back Memel, which had previously been given to Lithuania. Now Germany is trying to wrest Danzig from Poland. Will Danzig be the cause of the new war in Europe? It is difficult to say, because the attitude of the western democracies is so full of uncertainty.

The Treaty of Versailles has been ravished by Hitler. Germany, which it was the object of the Treaty of Versailles to destroy, has now become stronger than it was in the past. It had been forbidden to combine a democratic Germany with a democratic Austria, when this combination might perhaps have strengthened the forces of democracy in central Europe. But the annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany was not forbidden. In fact, in so doing they have abolished all that is left of democracy in central Europe. In the end the Nazis and the Fascists will turn their heat on to the western democratic countries.

Fascism and Nazism started off in the first place as nationalist movements in Italy and Germany. They were not intended for export. Now they are in the process of becoming an international movement. They are even likely to replace Communism as an international movement, which is now becoming a nationalistic movement in Soviet Russia. However, Fascism and Nazism cannot in any

way be claimed to be an international movement for the workers of the world, but only a movement in favour of dictators. Fascism and Nazism exert a far greater call on emotional and romantic young men because their creed is based on the creation of national pride and love of the fatherland. The international nature of the movement has in fact shown itself in the case of Czechoslovakia, where the Czech Nazis prefer to follow Hitler rather than the democratic leaders of Czechoslovakia. From being national movements, Fascism and Nazism have become ideological movements, which are opposed both to democracy and to Communism. That is why the Nazi Czechs are on the side of Hitler and oppose their own government. Support for Mussolini and Hitler means embracing an ideology which is aimed at making the entire world Fascist. The methods which were previously used by the Comintern (the Communist International) are now being followed by Fascism and Nazism. Just as in the past all Communist regarded Soviet Russia as their native land, now all Fascists and Nazis look upon Hitler and Mussolini as their natural leaders. Wherever the spirit of democracy is weak, that is where Fascism and Nazism will gain strength and develop. Therefore the way in which the Fascist and Nazi movements can be attacked is by strengthening the spirit of democracy and showing the people how much better a democratic government is than a dictatorship. People who live in countries where the only news they get is the news from the rulers of the country cannot be their own masters. This is the threat of the Fascist and Nazi movements.

If we think over the matter seriously, we must admit that the inheritance of that side is Fascism and Nazism. Versailles contained in itself the very forces to destroy itself. Oh, the fortunes of the human race!

First published in *Pandji Islam*, 1939.

32 '14th July'

Le système des déclarations des droits tend à déterminer les limites qui s'imposent à l'action de l'Etat . . . Ces principes supérieurs, la déclaration des droits ne les crée point; elle les constate et les proclame solennellement.

Léon Duguit (*Traité de Droit Constitutionnel III*, p. 603)

Two years ago the French people celebrated their Quatorze Juillet by extraordinary ceremonies. At that time it was exactly one hundred and fifty years from the date of their Great Revolution.[1]

One hundred and fifty years is a nice round figure and is a multiple of the jubilee figure of 50 and is often used as an excuse for exceptional celebrations. But there was another reason why the French people celebrated it at that time with such enthusiasm. They were threatened by Fascism and Nazism which was surrounding them.

Czechoslovakia had lost her independence and was conquered by the German Nazis, even though independence had been guaranteed to her by the four Great European Powers at Munich.

The French people could see quite clearly what the advantages of the Munich Agreement were to Hitler. He complied with any international agreements so long as he needed them. But when the time passed and his ambitions made it necessary, he easily forgot his undertakings and adduced many reasons in support of this. Poland, who had been his ally when he was fighting Czechoslovakia, now found that it was her turn to be his prey. The entire security arrangements of Europe were upset. The values of civilisation and morality no longer have any meating. That is because they do not serve any purpose for Hitler.

Naturally the Frenchmen feel that they are threatened and therefore they do all they can to encourage the spirit of the people in defence of the preservation of France's heritage and the rights of

her civilisation. The ceremony of the *Quatorze Juillet* (14th July) offers an excellent opportunity for making sure that the people are fully conscious of the danger which threatens them. We still remember the message of Edouard Herriot, the President of the French Parliament, who was the most popular politician of the time. He told his people that they must defend all three of the basic heritages of France:

Firstly the liberty of the French;

Secondly, French civilisation;

Thirdly, democracy which is the foundation of general civilisation.

The French cannot live without independence, he said. And civilisation will disappear if democracy, which is the very foundation of civilisation, can be destroyed by dictatorships. And when this happens, humanity will collapse into the mud. 150 years ago, he said, the French people rose to destroy the autocratic government which oppressed them. And now they must also destroy the autocratic government which is trying to wipe out their liberty and their civilisation. This message of Herriot did not only lift up the spirits of the French people, but it also lifted up the spirits of all people in the world who were lovers of peace.

When, a few weeks later, the French people went to war to fight German Nazism, we did not witness the spectacle of weeping wives and children in tears. People saw the soldiers off with gladness and smiles. People showed the spirit of the nation, the spirit which was to defend France and the liberty she prized. The soldiers themselves who were going to war also went in high spirits. They went to war with the idea of defending 'La France et la liberté'. In those days France and Liberty were the same thing to them. The French soldiers on their way to war felt that they were on a 'sacred mission'.

But unfortunately for the fate of France, the spirit of the French poeple at that time did not receive good leadership from above. The leaders of France did not encourage the efforts of the people to fight the foe, but they slept despite the enthusiasm of the people. This was one of the reasons why France gave up the struggle in June, 1940. The person in charge of the country's cabinet at that time was the weak leader, Marshal Pétain. Unfortunately he was assisted by advisers who were well known for their hypocrisy. At that time, the leaders who wished to continue to fight the enemy and wanted to transfer the site of government to East Africa were elim-

inated altogether. Herriot, who was praised so highly only two years previously, was imprisoned because he would not agree to submission to the German Nazis. The same thing happened to the other French leaders who wished to continue the fight . . . They were imprisoned, on Hitler's instructions. The patriot of Verdun, the most renowned of all French patriots, now became the supporter of the defeat of France. What a sad story for a country whose people value the price of freedom and have a deep love for their native land.

At that time the words of Schiller in regard to the French Revolution in 1789 rang particularly true:

'The century has given birth to a great era; but the great moment finds only a small-minded race'.

In fact France had a great opportunity in the twentieth century to carry out the task of civilisation, to destroy Nazi tyranny which was spreading the germs of plague around the world. The small-minded leaders of Vichy did not know how to make use of the opportunity placed before them. Consequently France received her greatest humiliation in history.

Pétain, an honest soldier, believed that France would still maintain her independence if he capitulated. He believed that Hitler would fulfill his promises and would not destroy France as an independent country in the new Europe.

The credulity of the old man was really surprising. It must have been the credulity of a desperate person, because history has shown repeatedly that Hitler could not be trusted. One knows that in the Nazi system there is only one person in power and all the others have to obey. Even Mussolini, who was not conquered by Hitler, became the slave of Hitler. All the decisions were made by Hitler and it was Mussolini who was forced to agree to the decisions. The same was bound to happen with Pétain or his successors. The system of dictatorship meant that one person alone was the leader and all the others had to follow the orders. A system of debate and discussion can only be carried out in a system of democracy. This is never to be found in either the Nazi or the Fascist systems. That is why anyone could have told that Hitler would give instructions which would have to be followed by the French, quite apart from carrying out the ceasefire agreement. The French would have to follow the same line as that which had been taken by Germany. Perhaps in the future the French will even be required to send her people to fight for Germany against Russia.

It has been the habit of the French people to celebrate their *Fête Na-*

tionale, the 14th July, for the last 150 years. This celebration forms part of their tradition. Last year the celebration was held during the sad period of the defeat of France in the war. Three days beforehand, on the 11th July, Pétain spoke with a strange voice, a voice which had never been heard by the people when celebrating their Fête Nationale. Pétain also spoke of 'liberté, égalité et fraternité' but these words had a meaning they never had before. And the people of France had to receive Pétain's message in a spirit of sorrow.

But what about this year? One year after experiencing the power of the Nazis? Which day will be celebrated by the French people this year? The 14th July or the 11th July? The day when Pétain received his marching orders? The day of independence or the 'day of the new order'? Or can the day of the new order be transferred to July 14th?

Pétain can do anything he likes, provided it is agreeable to Hitler. For this reason it is difficult to estimate what might happen. It may well be that there will be two different French celebrations. Independent France, outside the native land, will celebrate the 14th July, by declaiming the slogan 'liberty, equality and brotherhood'. The Vichy French will not be able to celebrate the day according to that slogan because of the 'new order'. Because the celebration of the 14th July in France is liable to raise up the spirit of liberty. The 'new order' means that the French spirit is enslaved. This seems impossible to France, but nevertheless France has experienced it.

Anyone who knows the French people cannot believe that Fascism and Nazism can grow and thrive in France. Nazism and Fascism require people who will easily submit and bow to the ruler. Maybe this will be true in Italy, because the people in Italy have shown that they can behave like sheep. One of them moves, and all the others will follow, the only condition being that they are allowed to express their pathos. *Ordnung* has a deep significance to the German. Ordnung is the very basic principle of their life.

But this is not the case with the French people. They hate orders and instructions and love the freedom to express their own thoughts. The French people are known as strongly individualistic people. It is in fact precisely because of the individualistic nature of their character that it is difficult to know which is the strongest party in France. In Parliament, even the members of the same party can be in conflict with one another. It even happens quite frequently that a member of the House of Representatives who is a member of one party can at one time leave the party and yet stand in the next

election as a member of a different party. Many of the French trade unions are influenced by anarchist tendencies. That is why the government in France is changed so easily and why a government can so easily be overthrown. It often happens that a general election shows that the Left-wing gets more representatives, but despite this fact the government in power is run by the Right-wing group.

The individualist character of the French has many defects but it also has the virtue that the French will not submit to arbitrary authority. Frenchmen like to defend their own opinion and at the same time to listen to the different opinions of other people. For this reason they tend to appreciate other ideas which are different from their own. Even though they are very strong in the support of their own views and their own opinions and can be very spirited and emotional in putting them forward, they will usually agree also to allow other people to put forward their opinions as well. This is a type of people which can only live within the framework of democracy. They will resist all kinds of autocracy, which is something which they can only bear with in times of war. For this reason the French people remain silent as they watch the Germans and Italians knuckling under Hitler and Mussolini. They often tend to regard the Germans and Italians as very meek people.

Léon Duguit clearly expressed his views regarding the character of the French people in his textbook on French Constitutional law and I have used his words as the motto at the beginning of this article.

The spirit of the French people is that they do not like to be ordered about and do not accept oppression. They like to be free. Hitlerism cannot develop there because there is no basis for it. If he pleases, he may make use of Laval and Pétain or Darlan as the gardener to water the seeds every day, but the soil of France is not fertile to grow such plants.

The 14th July will still ring with the spirit of liberty, equality and brotherhood. This is a motto which cannot be replaced by a strange new slogan like 'new order', which in point of fact, merely means to them 'accept slavery'.

And what people will accept slavery?

First published in *Pemandangan*, 14th July, 1941.

1. See my article about the 150th Anniversary of the French Revolution in *Pandji Islam*, 17th July 1939.

33 Becoming the ideological war

'Von der seelischen Stärke dieser Menschheit aber hängt es ab, ob sie dem dunklen Willen unterwirft, oder ob sie den Zwang meistert'.
Walther Rathenau *(Von kommenden Dingen)*

War has broken out in Europe because of Danzig! In point of truth, the war is not really liked by any of the countries who are fighting it.

The fact that the British and French do not like war can be clearly seen from their policies in recent years. They have shown that they are always ready to give concessions to the countries whose politics are based on the principle of the 'have-nots'. They know that the countries who wish to be the 'haves' must also possess 'man power'. Just try to reckon up how many countries have put up their plate in this way and yet war did not occur.

Neither does Hitler like the war. His policies are based only on intimidation and by threatening war. So far he has always succeeded in attaining his desires by intimidation alone. Austria, the Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia: all these he managed to get without war. He thought that by using the same tactics of intimidation and snarls he would also get Danzig and after this the Polish corridor. He firmly believed that the British would not dare to fight for another country. And he knew full well that if Britain refused to go to war, neither would the French stand up for Poland.

But this time Hitler made a miscalculation. There is an old proverb which says that there must be a limit to everything. And the patience of the British also has a limit. As a result of this miscalculation, war has broken out.

Right at the beginning of the war Hitler announced that he wanted peace. He said that once he had got Danzig and the return of the corridor, this would be the end of his demands. To France he says that he has no demands whatever against the French.

But the British refuse to end the war until the power of the Nazis

in Germany has been destroyed for all time. To the British, the war is not only concerned with the problems of Danzig and the Polish corridor: it has become an ideological war. In his message to the German people, Chamberlain said that the British were not fighting the German people, but were fighting the regime which had destroyed liberty and humanity. To succeed in this war, he said, the British would fight hard. There can be no doubt that Hitler was wrong in his estimate of the psychology of the British. In one of my earlier articles I wrote that the British being a trading nation are always in favour of compromises, except that once he has started fighting he will fight to the very end. It is now that the British are showing the other side of their character, the side which is not so easily visible during peacetime, that is their bulldog behaviour. Once the bulldog's bite is gripped on his victim he will not let go.

As a result of the British attitude the war is now becoming an ideological one, that is to say a war between democracy and Nazism. It is difficult to estimate whether the war will be restricted to its present area. The political world is very dynamic. The Italians, who are allied to the Germans, are still neutral in attitude and this will be a great factor in the war. And what about the problem between Russia and Japan? It is difficult to foretell. Being descendants of Macchiavelli, the politics of the Italians are always carried out after they have had a good look at the conditions. The Russian attitude, which at first seems to be rather a puzzle because she had made a 'cat and dog' agreement with Germany, is now becoming clearer. The Russians seem to be keen to associate with their great enemy in order to get part of Poland. Trotzky is being pursued as a traitor, Tushashevsky has been shot because he is accused of carrying on relationships with fascism, especially with the Germans. But these policies will be carried out by Stalin afterwards. His politics are rather like a see-saw. When we see conditions which are confused in this way, we are reminded of the words of Walther Rathenau in his book *Von kommenden Dingen* which we have used as a motto at the beginning of this article. He said: 'It depends on the spiritual strength of this humanity whether it will submit to this evil will or whether it will overcome the force applied.'

It is quite clear, then, that the war is not a war for defending national pride, but an ideological war, especially when we note the various attitudes of sections of the German people. The illegal

Socialist Freedom Party in Germany, in a letter sent to the Independent Labour Party in England, says that this is not a war of the German people, but a war of the German Nazis. They say that the German Socialists will support the British against the German Nazis. Any Germans who escape abroad will express their sympathy with the British. There are even Germans who would like to join the British Army. Perhaps in the future we shall find a new German government in Britain or France, consisting of the Weimar coalition group and who will take the place of the Nazis when they have been defeated. After all, has not Benes built up a free Czechoslovak government abroad? Why cannot the Germans do likewise?

Just as every struggle is a cause of mottoes and slogans this war has brought out many slogans on either side. The difference between the two types of slogan can be seen on either side of the River Rhine, where the Maginot Line faces the Siegfried Line.

Both by voice and in writing we know that the German side like to express their war cry in terms of 'Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer'. This is the basic idea of the German Nazi party.

But does this ring true in Germany as she is at present and does it give us a fair idea of what Hitler stands for? One country and one leader can always be found, even if he is not liked by the people. But is there one nation, one German nation, with its leader? No, there is not. People who do not possess any rights of their own and the foreigners who are undergoing oppression cannot be referred to as one nation. If they had the chance to carry out self-determination, the present Germany would be broken up into a number of different countries. Consequently the slogans which are being shouted are not supported by the people. To those people who have the spirit of democracy and whose leader is imprisoned in a concentration camp, Hitler is not their leader, but their greatest enemy. Their aim is to be freed from Nazi domination. Therefore it will not surprise us if these factions of the people will continue the fight from the inside while the German soldiers are fighting their enemy outside. The same will apply to the attitude of the Czechs and the Slovaks in the present German state. Some of the Czechs have already carried out a rebellion. Therefore we must say that the slogans the Germans are crying out in this war are weak ones.

The domestic position of Germany now is weaker than it was in 1914. In 1914 Germany was also an autocratic country. But in the

parliament there were representatives from many different groups, even if they only possessed a small amount of influence. At the beginning of the war Kaiser Wilhelm also urged them on, encouraging their nationalistic spirit. In those days even the workers' movements, that is to say the Social Democratic Party, supported the policies of the Kaiser.

Things are different with the present situation in Germany. The German Labour group, the German Catholic group and the German Democratic party are not able to make themselves heard at all. They are oppressed by Hitler and the majority of their leaders are languishing in concentration camps. The basic aim of all these groups is to be freed from oppression. Consequently they do not support Hitler, but instead they wish to defeat and overthrow the Nazi government. They would also like to make use of the war into which they have been led as a means of defeating Hitler. The enemy from the inside is far more dangerous than the enemy from the outside. The enemy from the outside can be attacked by strong and well equipped German soldiers. But how does one fight the enemy from the inside? Even the Gestapo cannot do anything if the attitude of hatred of the government has spread everywhere. It is possible to carry out mass arrests, it is even possible to carry out mass executions, as was the case in Prague. But if this is done the result will be to break the morale of the German people. Furthermore, if the war were to go on for a long time it will be necessary to find further soldiers to add to the German Army. Is it possible to find loyalty in soldiers who are enemies of their own government?

It may well be that the Nazi government can continue to live if the war only lasts a short time. The German Army is well known to be very highly disciplined and very strong. If the German Army can wage a lightning war it may well be that they can destroy their enemy in a short time. But can they persuade their opponents to fight a dynamic or lightning war? The history of the 1914 war shows us that a great deal of the fighting was carried out in the trenches. In a trench it is possible for a soldier who is weak to defend himself against the attack of an enemy who is stronger and to maintain this defence for a very long time. The trench war was not a dynamic war like the present war is. By using the tactics of a dynamic war, with the help of the Russians who stabbed Poland in the back, it was possible for Germany to defeat Poland in a matter of three weeks. But can the Germans smash the defences of the

Maginot Line in a short time? In any case, behind this line and waiting for them are French soldiers and British soldiers in large numbers. It is not possible for the dynamic war to be carried out on this front. Every second which passes means a decrease in the German hopes of winning the war.

And what is the slogan under which the French forces are fighting?

The Frenchmen are going to war under their old banner: 'Liberty, Equality and Brotherhood'. This is the basic national principle of France. Not so very long ago the French people celebrated the 150th anniversary of the French Revolution. On that day they confirmed once again their duty to defend the same principles which had brought about their success 150 years previously and which were now threatened by the Nazi movement.

Defend liberty: that is the slogan of every Frenchman today. The French soldiers are going to war to defend liberty. They fight enthusiastically because of the basic idea of the defence of liberty. At home they are supported by the whole of the nation. And in warfare morale is one of the main factors.

If the war does not spread and if it lasts a long time, it is easy to see who will be the winner and the Nazi movement will be ended.

If the war may truly be said to be an ideological war between democracy and fascism, then all people everywhere who have the spirit of democracy will hope that the democratic side will win. This is true even if the present democracies have not as yet been perfect. They must strengthen still further the spirit of democracy which is under threat and they must wage propaganda to show that the cause of democracy is the right one.

Within the democratic parties there are many conflicts of ideas about the way a democratic government should be built up. The democracy of the Liberal party is different from the democracy of the Socialist party and from the democracy of the freethinking Democratic party. There also exist very different ideas regarding how the democratic countries can rule colonised countries. But the stronger the spirit of democracy, the nearer we come to democracy.

Conversely, if the spirit of democracy is weakened by the forces of fascism, we get further and further away from what is really true democracy. For it can often happen that the spirit of fascism lives under the banner of democracy.

In the past we have seen that the progress of fascism and the

Nazi movements had a rapid influence on the old democratic parties. These parties often defended what is called in Dutch the *Gezagsprincipe*, namely the principle of authority. This was especially true of the old colonial countries. In their own countries they do not like to depart from the principles of democracy which give them the freedom to move and to act as they please, but when it comes to the management of the countries they have subjugated as colonies they wish to continue to adopt the principle of authority, which shows the influence of the basic thoughts of fascism. If the colonial government is mild and humane, they will criticise it. Because of the advance of the basic principles of fascism, the majority of the white men in colonised countries have a fascist spirit and regard themselves really as the masters. Also, wherever the spirit of the bureaucracy has gained greater strength, there it is that we all see more strongly the spirit of fascism, without the people even being conscious of it.

The mentality of the colonising peoples is accepted by the peoples who have been colonised as a sort of mental disease, arising from an inferiority complex. Because of their inferiority complex they like to express themselves in a different way, they like to idolise one leader. They regard their own group of people as a group of extraordinary creatures, a group of supermen who stand like a colossus over the world which dislikes them. Whenever the chance arises to show the hatred of others, they make full use of this opportunity. Because they cannot fight against the masters who are above them, they carry out their attacks on the people below them. Because they cannot kick their superiors, they kick their inferiors And who are inferior in their eyes? The persons inferior in their eyes are people who do not belong to their own group. Preferably people who are weaker than themselves, people who could not hit back. For at heart, a fascist is a coward. And they love to parade up and down carrying the ensigns and marks of power.

We do not need to look at some other country, such as India, to find a movement which calls itself a fascist movement. We only have to look at our own Indonesia. There are several youth movements, especially the 'scouts' who like to behave like fascists. It goes without saying that fascism can help to instil national feelings. And young men can easily be influenced by these. This movement is now aping the Hitlerjugend in honouring their leader. They like to use military uniforms which will strengthen the spirit of discipline. A little child who has only just learned to walk is placed in

military uniform. We are not saying that the youths we have mentioned above have consciously become fascist. We are merely saying that there are signs that the danger of fascism is slowly poisoning our society. For this reason we must ever be cautious. Any movement which finds its foundations in the cause of democracy must be supported, and not movements which are based on authoritarianism and dictatorship. We must always remember that the latter type of movement constitutes a slow poison, a danger.

The more progress the fascist movement makes in Europe, especially under the influence of the Nazis, the more confused becomes the spiritual life in democratic countries and the stronger the fascist mentality in colonised countries. That is why everyone who supports the spirit of democracy must hope and pray that the ranks of democracy will be the winner in this present ideological war. Once the Nazi party has been defeated, we can hope that Germany will be able to go back to a democratic system. They have already experienced how bitter living can be under Nazi authority. And once the German people have gone back to democracy, we will have reasons to hope that Central Europe will soon be a stronghold of democracy too.

If the Nazi movement in Germany is defeated but fascism in Italy is left where it is, we can only hope that Italian fascism will turn its back on its international objectives and concentrate on its national objectives. In the very beginning Italian fascism was not a creed to be spread over the world. At one stage Mussolini often said that fascism is not something for export. This is only reasonable, because the Italians have never set themselves up as brave men. If the countries surrounding Italy, like Germany and France, had also followed fascism, naturally foreign fascism would prove a danger to Italian fascism. Fascism is based on the principle of imperialism. If other countries adopted the fascist principles, this could develop into a strong feeling of imperialism and this would prove dangerous to Italy. That is why Mussolini has always said that Italian fascism should not be copied by other countries. Fascism, he said, was an Italian culture.

Some time afterwards, when German fascism came into being, under the name of Nazism, and proved to be very dynamic and was spreading to the left and to the right, Mussolini began to change his tune and began to suggest an international fascist association. For this reason he tried to push the Italians to seek some sort of

association with Germany. Once he had been caught in the German net, he was forced to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the two countries. But the Italians are fully aware of the meaning of this friendship, because what it really means is that the Germans made the decisions and the Italians are forced to follow suit. It is clear for everybody to see that Mussolini has become the second leader in Italy. I have even seen a cartoon which shows Mussolini as Hitler's third servant, after Göring and Goebbels. There is a lot of truth in this.

Friendship between democratic parties means that decisions are carried out by mutual agreement. But a friendship which is based on fascism means that the weak group must follow the lead of the stronger because fascism is based on the principle that 'the decisions come from the leader above'. Even if Mussolini is the cleverer of the two, since Hitler has greater power, then it is Mussolini who must submit to Hitler.

Once the spirit of democracy has regained its strength in Europe, we can only live in hope that this spirit will spread to every place in the world and will even go as far as influencing the attitudes of colonising governments. The fall of the fascist governments in Europe can only be to the advantage of the colonised peoples of the world. It is only from democracy that we can expect progress towards our own ideals. With the war in its present stage, everyone who is fired by the spirit of democracy must know which way to look at the future. We must not be guided by thoughts of 'what is most expedient at present' but by thoughts of 'what will be best for our country in the end'.

First published in *Pandji Islam*, no. 41, 9th October 1939.

34 The French Revolution

Eine grosse Epoche hat das Jahrhundert geboren;
Aber der grosse Moment findet ein kleines Geschlecht.
Schiller.

14th July 1939!

Exactly 150 years ago today was the time of the French Rovolution, which is regarded as the prototype of Western Democracy. It is therefore only natural that this event should be celebrated in the Western World. There can be no doubt that Frenchmen celebrate their *Quatorze juillet.*

On that day Frenchmen usually forget all their worries. Old and young, tall and short, all of them enthuse and dance and sing everywhere. All the squares and streets become dance-floors. Long live the *Fête Nationale*! On that day Frenchmen everywhere give expression to their feelings of nationalism and patriotism, feelings which are always close to their hearts. So the celebration of the 14th July 1939, which marks the 150th anniversary of this great event, must be even more glorious than past celebrations. It will be celebrated with even greater fervour because on that day the Government can use this enthusiasm for lifting up the spirit of the people so that they will protect their heritage from the threats of Fascism and Nazism.

14th July 1789!

On that day the people of Paris wrested the fortress of the Bastille from the King's guards. The fortress, which was used as a prison for political prisoners, was to them the symbol of authoritarianism, and tyranny such as existed at that time. Anyone who was able to obtain a *lettre de cachet*, which indeed was a form of warrant, could give instructions for his enemy to be imprisoned in the Bastille. It was an easy matter for a man possessing influence and money to obtain such a *lettre de cachet* bearing the King's signature. The Bastille itself thus expressed the spirit of absolute and infinite sovereignty.

This meant that with the fall of the Bastille into the hands of the people of Paris, the feudal monarchy in France was crushed. According to the way of thinking in feudal times, anyone who held sway in Paris could exercise authority throughout the whole of France. This meant to say that whoever took Paris, took control of the whole of France. In other words, the success of the people of Paris meant the success of the people of the country as a whole. The secret of feudal sovereignty can best be expressed by the proverb 'The tail follows the head', which means that the whole country would follow whatever happened in Paris. But it was this feature which was also the weakness of the feudal state. In other words, the fall of feudalism in Paris meant the fall of feudalism throughout the whole of France.

14th July 1789!

This day there was born a new watchword which was to be heard on the lips of everyone: *Liberté*, *Egalité*, *Fraternité*. Liberty, equality and brotherhood. This watchword was the very expression of the happiness which arose from freedom from feudalism, a feudalism which held human beings in shackles and created a condition of near-slavery. Once his bonds were broken, Man could live freely and this freedom would create equality which in turn could lead to brotherhood. Does not religion at all times teach men that all men are equal before God and that all men must live together in peace and amity? Men who believed in the righteousness of living rejoiced to be free from feudalism because feudalism was regarded as the obstacle to brotherhood. Brotherhood can be created easily between persons who are regarded as equals. Between master and slave there can be no brotherhood. So long as the feudal system was making use of master and slave classes, brotherhood of Man could never come into being. The philosophy of this great moment on the 14th July 1789 was that the concentration of material benefits was broken and a light was lit which meant that a way was opened up to the ordinary man to earn a decent living once again. This ability to earn a living, to achieve their own livelihood, was regarded as a paramount condition of happiness. Even before the event had happened they had heard the voice from over the Channel from the great author Adam Smith who had taught that the spirit of a country rose when everyone was free to do what he was able to do according to his ability, provided it did not infringe on the liberties of others.

This group had concentrated only on the question of 'liberty' and

had forgotten about 'equality' and 'brotherhood'. They had got bogged down in the first word of the slogan and had forgotten the other two. Not because they were not in favour of 'equality' and 'brotherhood', but because according to their way of thinking these other two features would follow provided liberty had once been won. It was up to Liberty to bring with it the 'equality' and 'brotherhood'. This is why they laid all their stress on the need to regain freedom. This was their philosophy at that time, prior to the great event which took place on the 14th July 1789.

To the 'have-nots', that is to say the poor people who had to wrest a living by hard work, who felt that they were strongly oppressed by their 'superiors', that is to say the people who thought they were superior in rank and property, this was the great event of all time, an event which would improve their life beyond measure. At last they would enjoy freedom, they would be free from oppression and the gateway to a pleasant life would be opened up to them. A pleasant life with the equality and brotherhood of people. The time when they had to wander aimlessly around the cities, hungry and without jobs, was now to disappear for ever. How wondrous a thing it was to be able to look forward to the future. In their new-found happiness they shouted loud their slogan 'Liberty, Equality, Brotherhood'. Even though a few groups felt things differently, at this most important moment of all, they were all at one in their happiness. And it was this instant which Schiller was able to describe so accurately in the poem which I have quoted at the beginning of this article.

He said: 'The century has given birth to a great era; but this great moment finds only a mean-minded race'.

This meanness of mind showed itself in the way the slogans were finally transmuted into practice. The cries were negative because they were cries of gladness at the disappearance of a life in shackles, without the ability to construct something positive, that is, to create conditions which would guarantee the continuance of 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity'. It is therefore not surprising that in the later analyses of sociology and economics, the French Revolution has been called an 'individual revolution', a revolution which liberated men's personality but did not liberate society. It was in the French Revolution that the rationalist philosophy movement in the era of 'enlightenment' found its great opportunities. This was the movement which used the brain of Man as a tool to bring into being the great inventions of society.

The success of the people found its expression in the proclamation which was called the 'Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et des Citoyens', which was received by the 'Assemblée Nationale Constituante' on the 26th August 1789. This proclamation was built up of seventeen chapters. In the Preamble to this Proclamation it stated that poverty and the wrongness of government in the past were caused by lack of knowledge and understanding, by the overlooking of basic human rights. It stated that human rights were a fundamental fact of nature and could not be disregarded. The acknowledgment of human rights and of the dignity of citizens had to serve as a basis for all government. These rights had to provide the basic principles for establishing the rules to be followed by authorities and the rights and obligations of citizens.

Anyone who has read the statements of these seventeen chapters carefully will see quite clearly that the slogans which originally pointed him in this direction, have taken the form of differing aims. In the first chapter it states quite truly that 'Man is born and lives with freedom and all men are subject to the same law' – words which remind us of Rousseau – but there is no mention whatsoever of the motto 'Liberté, Egalité, et Fraternité'. In chapter two it states that fundamental human rights must be safeguarded by the whole of the political organisation, this being expressed in terms of liberty, property and security, accompanied by opposition to any form of oppression.

Here it can clearly be seen what group had managed to exert the greatest influence in the way the argument was developed. Alongside the political chapters discussing Liberty, Security and opposition to oppression, it was also recognised that the ownership of property was a right which was not to be infringed. Chapter seventeen states unequivocally that the ownership of property must not be upset and that it constitutes a powerful right. It could only be countermanded if this was in the general or national interest and then it could only be done if proper compensation were paid.

This specific acknowledgment of the ownership of property as a powerful right which could not be destroyed, was symptomatic of the success of the middle classes, the bourgeoisie and was a true reflection of the nature of society at that time. At that time the middle classes were the only people who remained in possession of property. The property belonging to the royal families had been confiscated and given away to large numbers of peasants. But the middle classes still retained their properties and still exerted a

great influence on national production. Their possessions were not so much land, but the machinery of production. The general and widespread anger against the nobility had led men to overlook the genesis of the capitalist, who was to become the master of the future.

Before the outbreak of the French Revolution, society had already begun to enter the early age of capitalism. During that period, there had still been a dispute between two classes, but it was essential for them to cooperate: these were the capitalists who possessed the machinery of production, and the workers who owned nothing except their own power to work. Nevertheless, the class who possessed the economic power enjoyed no political power according to their position in the society of that day.

In feudal times all political power was vested in the highest authority of the realm, namely in the king. For this reason, when demanding their rights, labour and capital worked together in their fight against the royal authority. After the breakdown of feudalism, the political power was transferred to the group which possessed economic power.

The influence of the 'have' group was very clearly represented in the 1791 Constitution[1] which basically contained the 'acknowledgment of human rights and the rights of citizens'. In the Preamble to the Constitution consisting of the seventeen chapters there were explained the rights which had been reduced and also the statement that associations of workers were forbidden. This meant to say that according to the Constitution workers were forbidden to create a union. Probably this regulation was the result of the statement of the freedom which 'forbade any dependency of one person on another'. A person was to be free to move and also to earn his living. But if we look at this in the light of modern principles, we can see that this prohibition was bound to remove the weapon which workers could use in their struggle.

Furthermore it had to be added that the mere acknowledgment of the rights of human beings and citizens, which were regarded as all-powerful and indestructible, did not ensure security in society. The struggle between the two remaining classes continued to increase, namely between the middle class and the lower middle class. The latter group was deemed to include the workers in Paris. In the field of politics, this controversy between the Girondin group and the Jacobin group meant that the aim of equality and brotherhood had been forgotten. The main subject which was then discussed was how to obtain and maintain liberty. At first the in-

fluence of the radical group was the stronger. This could be seen in the case of the 1793 constitution which was put forward to replace the 1791 constitution, and which was basically the same acknowledgment of human rights and citizens' rights. At the time of the revolution it was possible for changes to take place more rapidly so that a national common law could be established which basically acknowledged the strong rights of citizens which could never be abolished, whereas after two years it was no longer possible to make any change. What happened in actual fact was that the seventeen chapters of the law turned out to be thirty-five chapters.

Chapter 1 explained as follows: 'The purpose of society is collective security. Government is created in order to guarantee that everyone can enjoy his right and that these rights cannot be abolished'. Here we can see that the guarantee that a human being must possess freedom, as written in the 'Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et des Citoyens' has now disappeared. There has been a change of heart, first from a prison to a society which represented all people, and then to collective security, *le bonheur commun*, the common good, being the principal object.

Chapter 2, which explained what human rights were that could not be revoked, referred to them as 'equality, liberty, security and property ownership'. Just look at the order of sequence! Now the word 'equality', which was not to be found in Chapter 1, has taken pride of place.

Chapter 6 explained what was meant by *liberté* (liberty). This was the power which was given to man to enable him to carry out his rights provided they did not upset other people. His right of liberty was restricted by moralistic demands. Do not do unto others the things that you would not wish them to do to you. For liberty to hold sway, it had to be interpreted within the terms of the Holy Book. Chapter 18 provided justification for the protection of workers from their masters, whilst Chapter 21 set out the obligations of the government towards its citizens who possess no jobs, requiring it to give them assistance to enable them to live. 'Les secours publics sont une dette sacrée'. Assistance to poor citizens was a sacred obligation!

But this was not all. In a section of the Constitution entitled 'Acte constitutionnel', Chapter 21 and following, there was set out the justification of the rights of the public to vote in elections. It

was this very public which had to be the basis of national representation, Chapter 21 stated. Chapter 29 went on to say that every Frenchman could exercise his rights and be elected throughout the whole of France. And Chapter 29 explained further that every representative member of the Council had the duty to represent all people.

The comments I have set out above clearly show that the principle of democracy had been fully appreciated in the 1793 Constitution. Here it was society and the public which enjoyed the first priority. The 1793 Constitution was the most extensive basis of law for the whole of France and one which has held sway until today.

In the year 1795 the situation reverted again. The influence of the middle classes became stronger again. The 1793 Constitution was withdrawn. On the 22nd August 1795 (5th Fructidor of the IIIrd Year) the new constitution was created, which once again restricted the basis of democracy. Full franchise for the citizen ('tout citoyen') was now replaced by franchise for the property-owner, for the rich, a franchise which limited that number of members of the public (Titre IV Chapter 35). The authority of the Representative Council was whittled down by giving the authority and power to the Executive Council which consisted of a 'directoire de cinq membres', the five-man council. It was this regulation which paved the way for Napoleon to become the principal Consul and then to become an Emperor. The ascent of Napoleon to the top rank of sovereignty in the Government can be regarded as the end of the age of the Constitution, the age of the agreement between the people which had had its inception in the year 1789. Until the year 1848, the year when the French Republic was created once again, the spirit of the year 1789 disappeared from the French Constitution.

If we consider the historical work 'The Declaration of Human Rights and the rights of citizens' (in Jellinek's book *Die Erklärung der Menschen und Bürgerrechte*) we must agree with him that this 'Declaration' was truly a hollow Pathos (*hohles Pathos*). But, even though it was really hollow, it exerted a strong influence on the laws of the state in every country of Europe. As explained by Jellinek himself, the laws of the state literally only set out the rights of the Head of the State and the privileges of the ruling parties or special groups of people or persons. As regards the people them-

selves, all that was set out was an explanation of the obligations they had towards the State itself. They possessed no fundamental rights to make their demands to the State. There was merely a declaration of human rights within the meaning of natural law, but there was no positive law to support them. The declaration of human rights was entirely taken up with the duty of citizens to the State as a whole. This was the declaration which referred to the rights of citizens as positive law, but these rights had to be recognised by the State Constitution. There was no modern constitution which did not contain the rights of citizens, such as the freedom to speak and to write, the freedom to practise any religion, the right to own property. The guarantee of the freedom of people by the force of law itself – all these items have to be written into a modern constitution today. The extent to which each country governs these rights can be seen in a book published by Aulard and Murkine-Guetzevich, *Les déclarations des droits de l'homme*.

In this way it will be seen that the spirit of 1789 which came into being with the French Revolution gave rise to many results, at least on paper.

After the completion of the struggle against reaction in 1848, when rebuilding the Republic, Frenchmen everywhere began to remember their old slogan which was capable of re-creating their spirit of democracy. In the Constitution of the French Republic, which was ratified by the Representative Council of the 4th November 1848, it stated in the Preamble of Chapter IV that the French Republic was based on 'la liberté, l'égalité et la fraternité', liberty, equality and brotherhood. The basis of the Republic was to be family, employment, ownership of property and the sovereignty of the public.

Here for the very first time the position of the workers was acknowledged in the State Constitution, and this acknowledgment forms the very foundation of the Republic. Political progress since that time has in part been taken up in an extension of the rights of workers, until they enjoyed the same rights as those enjoyed by the group of property owners. By the grant of rights of franchise, Western democracy became the very pinnacle of political democracy. But, nevertheless, the position it had reached was still far from being what can be termed social democracy. There was democracy in the field of politics, but not in the field of economy. For this reason present-day western democracy has not succeeded in practice as yet in achieving the main aims of true western democracy, name-

ly those set out in the well-known trilogy of 'Liberty, Equality and Brotherhood'. This basic principle of the French Constitution only exists as an empty slogan and one which cannot be shown to have been put into practice. But the very reason for inserting these principal aims of democracy in the Constitution was to come to be regarded as grounds for demanding their being put into practice. Of the three qualities set out in the slogan, liberty, equality and brotherhood, it is only the first which has proved successful in western democracy. This is the only part of the slogan which has been put into practice by the men of the west who call themselves democrats. And, following the slogans of bourgeois society, the western democracies are travelling along the wrong path.

But in the middle of the last century a new thinker came, Karl Marx, who continued once again the chain of thought of the French Revolution, which had temporarily been cut off. He was the first man to emphasise that no democracy was complete if political democracy was not complemented by economic democracy. Economic democracy demanded that all the means of production should be in the hands of the people as a whole for its benefit as a whole.

The workers' movement which is based on his method of thinking has put his ideal into practice. And a great deal of success has been achieved in this direction. Opening up the way to succeed in achieving true democracy is the success achieved by Marx, a success which cannot be forgotten.

Although it is 150 years old, western democracy has still remained deficient up to the present time, because it still continues to practise inequality. The actions carried out in the name of western democracy are still in opposition to the basic principles of democracy itself. The confused mental attitudes which followed the Great War and the poverty of the people resulting from the cruel crises which also followed it, provided the environment for the creation of a new line of thought, a line of thought which suggested that the principle of inequality was a remedy for sick society. This new line of thought, which gave rise to the Fascist and the Nazi movements, made use of the *Führerprinzip*, namely the principle of obedience to the leader. In this it opposes the true basis of democracy, which is based in theory on the authority of the people themselves, acting through their elected representatives. Fascism and Nazism altered their action from a nationalist movement towards an ideological movement. In so doing they not only upset the democracy of nationalism, but they also upset the democracy of internationalism. The

basic struggle is: which ideology will in the end rule the world.

If we take a look at the present map of Europe, we can see that the ideal of 1789 has become more and more restricted. It has been destroyed in Central Europe and Southern Europe which have now been conquered by Nazi and Fascist ideals.

All the activities of Nazism and Fascism are offensive in character and they bring about changes in many of the structures of western democracy. It is a general ideal among present democracies that one wants a strong man as the leader of a government. In the past, a strong man was reared and distrusted if he became a dictator. For this reason he would be defeated before he reached that pinnacle of government authority. This is what has happened particularly in the case of France. Now they are looking for a strong man to carry out the method of government of Nazism and Fascism. Such a man is often given dictatorial powers, which means the opportunity to rule by decree, to carry into effect his own decisions without needing the agreement of Parliament. But with all this power, he is still not yet a dictator. However great the authority which has been bestowed upon him, he is still subject to the Representative Council and can be overthrown by it. The very mark of a democratic government is that the government must resign if it has failed to achieve the support of the Representative Council. This principle has still not yet been changed, even though the path of authoritarian democracy has varied as time has gone on.

The weakness of present-day democracy is that it is not capable of fighting the poverty of the people and is not capable of raising their standard of living. Fortunately for the democracies, their enemies, Fascism and Nazism, are still less able to do anything about it. Everyone will agree that democracy is a plant which grows only with difficulty.

When the western democracies are celebrating the principle of 1789, which is now 150 years old, it would be a good plan for them to look closely at their weaknesses instead of merely smugly gloating over the fact that they are 150 years old but possess empty slogans and are achieving practically nothing!

First published in *Pandji Islam*, 1939.

1. A collection of French constitutions and State institutions from 1791 to 1914 is found in *Les constitutions et les principales lois politiques de la France depuis 1789*, compiled, with historical notes, by Léon Duguit and Henri Monnier.

35 Fascism and paradox

Fascism is a reaction against democracy and the result of the era which followed the Great War. In addition to this, it is a creed of narrow nationalism which is opposed to internationalism and Marxism and enshrines an ambition to become a great nation. Whilst Marxism shows very clearly what it stands for and its aim, Fascism prefers to hide behind a misty vagueness. It gathers its strength from shouting vague slogans. It exerts its influence on the public because of its creation of a sense of jubilee and because of its conjuring up of national pride. In his speech in October 1922, before starting the march on Rome, Mussolini said:

'We create a myth; this myth is our faith, a holy gladness. It is not necessary to seek reality or truth. It is our hopes and expectations which form the basis of our beliefs and of our courage. Our myth is a nation, a great nation, which we can employ as a basic truth.'

Anyone reading these words will at once perceive the number of paradoxes, the contradictory principles of fascism. In actual fact it has no philosophical concept. All it has is a political effort. When a great nation is aiming at success it regards as permissible all means which can quickly bring about the final aim. Just as in the sixteenth century, now once again there was an Italian suggesting political principles which the Germans call 'Das Prinzip der politischen Wirklichkeit'.

In his book called *The Prince*, Machiavelli stated that greed was a usual norm of human behaviour and if a man possessed a 'cold hand' for increasing his property, this was to his credit. On the other hand, if he was unable to succeed in his wishes and was still obtaining his property by various other means, no blame could attach to him. Machiavelli's motto was 'In politics there are no crimes but blunders'.

According to this theory, government is an apparatus for deciding how to use power for the satisfaction of its own ego. It is better

for a government to be feared than to be loved. Power is eternal so long as government possesses authority. Love is not eternal, because it cannot be possessed by a government. Machiavelli said that there were two features present in every struggle.

The first of these is right and the second is might. The first of these concepts is the concept for struggles by men, whilst the second is that for the struggles of animals. But because he cannot obtain satisfaction by the first method of fighting, man has to go back to the second method of fighting. A prince has to carry on both methods at the same time: both as a man and as an animal. The authority governing a country has to copy the behaviour of animals, either that of a fox or that of a lion. He must act like a fox when he wishes to avoid dangerous traps. He must act like a lion when he has to face a wild dog. If princes only behave like lions, this means that they do not understand the nature of their task. This means to say that a wise prince does not have to fulfil his agreement if the conditions existing are not the same as the conditions existing at the time when he entered into the agreement. This would be a bad thing if all human beings possessed good characters, but since man has both a bad and cruel behaviour, there is no need to be honest and it is unreasonable to blame a man who is unable to fulfil his promises.

It was no surprise that Machiavellian views had a great influence on the theory and practice of the laws of state in the Sixteenth Century, and now another Italian has been born to carry on the idea of his old Italian predecessor. And the means he is using for carrying on this idea is called *Fascism*. Machiavelli's ideas are frequently put into practice in the field of diplomacy. But it is Mussolini's wish to carry this idea into practice in the field of politics. Mussolini openly recommends Machiavellian means and openly states that he wishes to see the rebirth of the glorious Roman Empire.

In point of fact, the birth of fascism was brought about by an intrinsic feeling of inferiority in the international world. Italy, which together with its allies, was one of the victors in the Great War, failed to obtain any advantages from winning the war. Her aim to rule the entire Adriatic coast did not succeed. That part of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire on the other side of the Adriatic Sea was then occupied by Yugoslavia, the creation of France. The colonies of Germany and Turkey which were won by the Allies at the Peace Conference were grabbed by the British and the French. It was felt that the losses suffered by Italy during the World War

were under-estimated. For this reason Italians felt that their country was regarded as a second-class nation. Precisely the same may be said of the Germans. The low rank and position of inferiority which Germany acquired at the Versailles Peace Conference constitute the main reason for the rise of nationalism which has brought Hitler to the position of highest authority in the country.

The basic principle of Fascism is the need to fight against the existing situation. It is the outcome of an inferiority complex. Mussolini, who previously held socialist views, gave up his old beliefs and opinions with regard to democracy and socialism because of the low rank held by Italians in international relations. The purpose of democracy is to place the power in the hands of the people, whereas Mussolini only regards the people as a large number of goats who are not capable of doing anything for themselves and who must of necessity be controlled by a shepherd and driven in the right direction.

It is the great paradox of the fascist movement in Italy that first of all we have Mussolini as a socialist fighting on the side of the workers, struggling to raise the status of the proletariat. Then we find him as a Fascist trying to raise the prestige of his nation, a nation which is treated as a proletariat by foreign countries. Italy is a country which is poor as regards raw materials and industrial production. She possesses no iron or coal and has no oil or other minerals which form the basis of production in the present-day world. Her livelihood as a nation is dependent upon foreign countries. Her people have to sell their manpower on the international market. These are the reasons why the Fascists are constantly saying that their people are being treated as the proletariat mass by the materialistic and capitalistic nations. It is this idea, this desire to live with honour and not as an inferior proletariat, which imparted to Italian fascism the hate of materialism and capitalism. But this only holds good in theory. In practice it is not true. In the theory of the cooperative state put forward by Mussolini, there is opposition to capitalism which is recommended by the liberal group based on a principle of 'free competition' and 'free enterprise'. Nevertheless, the ideas put forward by Mussolini are still influenced slightly by his old precepts. He still brings in socialism to a small extent. And if we carefully look at the 'cooperative state' which he proposes, it is not really very different from the guild type of socialism which is so popular in England.

But how does all this pan out in practice? In his effort to make

the cooperative state succeed, Mussolini suppresses every movement which is suggestive of the class struggle and crushes all the old workers' unions which were based on the struggle of the classes. Labour and capital are ordered to cooperate under the control of the State, which wields the entire power. The entire dispute is resolved by the State and the decision of the State must be obeyed. At the present time the capitalists hold the lion's share in the distribution of property, and the fascists do not abolish private ownership of heavy industry, so that capitalist power goes on undisturbed. This is why the putting into practice of the principles of Fascism for industrial peace makes the capitalists a great deal happier than the workers. This is why these laws are disliked.

Carmen Haider, who is more of a capitalist than a socialist, stated in the *Political Science Quarterly* (December 1933) that 'in this sense Fascism is not only conservative but actually reactionary'. He also went on to say that the capitalists constitute the stronger section of our present society, both in the eyes of the law and because of the condition in which they find themselves. In this way they are the people who exert the greatest influence on those in power. It is as a result of these present conditions that the regulations which have been promulgated are all pro-capitalist.

In view of these circumstances, it is only natural that the capitalists have leaned on Mussolini and used fascism as a tool in their struggle against democracy.

There was a time when the capitalists were supporting and proposing democracy. That was when they were fighting a feudal state. In those days it was democracy which they used as a tool for their own ends.

But when democracy became more powerful and began to constitute a danger to capitalism, they began to shun it. The influence of trade unions on the government of the country became stronger, so that the activities of capitalists began to be controlled by various social regulations. That is why they found it necessary to destroy the workers' movement. This is the reason why the capitalists felt it was necessary for them to help the fascists, even though they were not completely in favour of Mussolini. On the altar of the 'cooperative state' and of 'class peace', the fascists sacrificed the needs of labour to the demands of capital.

This is the great paradox which we find in Fascism. It is a movement aimed at abolishing the proletariat status of the nation itself

and yet at the same time at destroying the hopes and aims of the proletariat workers who are striving to improve their lot.

First published in *Pemandang*, no. 104, 2nd February 1934.

36 On character

And if you ask me: What is the origin of the courage which we find so remarkable? The origin of the great and lasting courage which can fill a whole life is to be found in the love of a great ideal, greater and more long-lasting than we are ourselves.
Prof. J. Goudriaan (*translated from the Dutch*)

During the last few years it has been the tendency for people to write biographies of leaders and the great men of our community. It is the habit now not only to write the biography of men who have passed away, but also to write the biographies of people who are still alive at the present time. Even though we may have a new leader who has only just made his appearance in our society, we find that his biography has already been written. It is also possible for us to find books which contain a collection of biographies of several leaders, with a brief note on each one. We have this kind of book, for example, in the work by Aziz Thaib and Tamir Djaja called *Pustaka Indonesia* (the Indonesian Literature) in two volumes. In addition to this we find that the pages of our magazines often contain what are biographies in the guise of news.

All these cannot be regarded strictly as biographies, because their sole aim appears to be that of idolising the leaders and great men. In order to be a biography, it is necessary for them to contain an analytical discussion and to describe the character and behaviour of the great men concerned. It is obvious that in the first place the biography must be written by a person who knows a very great deal about the patriot he is writing about, or he must actually have followed his subject during his lifetime. In preparing the biography it is possible to discuss the information received with that received from other sources. When a person has recognised the behaviour and character and the way of thought set out in the original biography, it is then possible to estimate the degree of conviction and

the moral fibre of the patriot in the struggle of his life. One can learn a lot about the history of the struggle of a patriotic thinker from newspapers, magazines, his papers and any messages or speeches he published. It is a difficult problem to seek out the real matter for a biography. The basic ideas, the spirit which stirred him and influenced him in his struggles, really cannot be known from the mere account of the history of his life. And yet if we do not know the basic factors, in truth we are not capable of writing a biography.

We have already said that generally speaking biographies are only written for idolising a hero. The more inferior the biography is, the greater will be the idolisation of the great man the biography describes. Descriptions of this kind will satisfy a very large number of readers, but they are absolutely useless to the man himself who has been described or to the next generation which wishes to learn lessons from the past. A true and properly written biography can be copied again by the next generation, but an inferior-type biography without stressing the character of the man concerned can never serve any useful purpose. If the person himself who has been described by the biographer is still alive, all this praise can make him forget what his real life was like and encourage him to be proud. There are many leaders who have fallen low as a result of praise and idolisation.

So far as I am concerned, I am more likely to hear or read statements showing my failures and my shame rather than praise and eulogy. In any case praise cannot provide any guidance for the future. But a true analysis which shows our guilt and mistakes, induces us to efforts to improve our behaviour.

Man is far from being a perfect character. He must strive at all times to correct his mistakes and improve his behaviour. The aim of our life and of all our efforts, as Pascal said, is to tend towards perfection. By effort and goodwill we can succeed in achieving some result, however small this may be. Our task is to continue to educate ourselves. Only then are we in a position to teach others.

A man who is fond of carrying out self-criticism, may find all this praise upsetting. It is quite usual for men to like to be praised, or even to like to praise themselves. The psychology of men is now also influenced by advertisements. It is becoming the usual practice to accept from his own lips the self-rating of the proud. But if one is to praise, it is best to show a person's value resulting from his efforts for the common good. His efforts to reach his ideal.

There are a number of writers whose pleasure it is to analyse the character of their leaders by describing them in terms of a question. This is merely the use of a cliche and the work is nothing more than an imitation. In this way we have mere borrowed phrases such as the characterisations prepared by Dr. Amir.

Dr. Amir has produced a number of prototypes of great men. He has found the genius type and the talented type. As examples he quoted H. A. Salim and the late Dr. Rivai. Now there are a great number of men who can be said to belong to the talented type, but it is a very difficult thing to meet the type of man who can truly be said to be a genius. There is only one Salim-type in Indonesia, Dr. Amir says, but there are very many more of the Rivai-type. A genius man may be said to be a man who possesses original ideas and gets his ideas all in a flash. Skilfully and quickly he uses the gifts of God with which he was born. For this reason he understands his lessons extremely fast. A talented man, on the other hand, is a man whose intelligence is obtained by the training of his brain. This intelligence does not appear by itself automatically. Genius may be said to be an original intelligence; talent is an intelligence which has to be nurtured and grow.

So far as my own opinion is concerned, there is in Indonesia another genius besides H. A. Salim. There is Drs. R. M. Sosrokartono, who lives at Bandung where he is known as the 'Water Doctor'. He is not known to the general public because he does not get reports in the national press and he doesn't use his intelligence to put his name before the public. It may well be that there are more geniuses than this in our own people, but their genius has never been allowed to develop because they did not receive any education and never attended school.

This description of men by prototypes, as suggested by Dr. Amir, is bound to be copied by a number of writers of biographies who really do not possess sufficient knowledge for describing the persons whose biographies they are writing. This means to say that they will be merely selling a blurb. What is the point served by our young writers in questioning our great men whose intelligence and knowledge are too great for them to understand? Biographies of this kind would better be written by psychologists and sociologists and specialists in the field. Merely classifying the various leaders according to categories does not explain their behaviour, as this will differ between them even when we are dealing with great men at the same level of achievement. If a good analysis is made, on the

other hand, this would serve a useful purpose and would benefit those reading it. If the analysis is carried out skilfully and carefully, it can influence the spirit of our young men, who usually possess many ideas. It may well be that they themselves would like to be a genius and that they pray to God to help them to become great men. Or else among them we find men who would like to be talented and will try to succeed on the basis of their own sustained efforts. But, whatever may come of all this, the most important thing for the young man is his own character.

One may well be a genius or even a talented person but nevertheless not possess a strong character nor have the willingness or desire to defend one's own country. To be a genius without using one's genius for the public good but only for one's personal needs is not a virtue which can be valued by the people at large. Talents which are only used for personal success and for achieving a good position in society and personal pleasure cannot be regarded as an asset to the people of a country. As regards people like this, the most that can be said is that one can be proud that the country has indeed produced such geniuses and talented persons. But to the People's Movement itself these persons are quite useless. Indonesian people who have ideas regarding the equality which exists between the Indonesian nation and other nations need leaders who possess true character.

For this reason we must be sure that we educate ourselves in such a way as to develop our characters.

I agree with Dr. Amir that a great man cannot just be produced by education and by following special courses, that a great man is a person of natural ability, a person who has possessed the gift of God since he was a child. It is true that there are not large numbers of great leaders, whether talented or genius and we know that the progress and advance of the People's Movement is not dependent solely on possessing great leaders. Lower-grade and middle-grade leaders are also required, just in the same way as soldiers do not only need generals and field-marshals but also corporals, sergeants and lieutenants. And these lower-grade leaders can certainly be produced by training and education at school or anywhere else. In this case the important thing is not a matter of just intelligence but of character and force of will. These are the people who can be of such great use especially in colonial countries and countries who have recently won their independence. Many times we witnessed the truth in history that the progress of a nation can be broken be-

cause there is no leader who possesses character. The sorrowful events in 1940 in France, which possesses many people of genius, are a very good example of this fact. French leaders who were in power at the beginning of the War could certainly be regarded as clever and intelligent persons. But they were persons who did not possess character. There was no great man like Clémenceau, Poincaré and Foch among them. It is true that there were persons of character, but they possessed no authority in the Government, such as Hérriot, Léon Blum and so forth.

It is clear from all this that it must be character and not intelligence which must be the aim of education in our universities. In point of fact it is the university which brings out the character of a person. Character is more important than mere intelligence. Persons of character can succeed where those of intelligence only cannot. Intelligence is not sufficient to create character in a person.

The professorial method of educating students can be judged by the way problems are solved. Students are not only taught the theories of their own professor, but also the theories which are in opposition to the opinion of their own professor. It will be seen from this that the professor educates his students to take a didactic and logical attitude, which in turn will influence the character of the students. The universities do not merely hand out knowledge to students, but also understanding and critical judgment.

The progress of science will be assured by a man who possesses character and knows how to value the opinions of other people and to defend his own opinion. A man who possesses character is able to defend his own opinion, even though it clashes with the opinion of the majority. It is only as a result of critical judgment that any progress in the sciences can take place.

An intelligent person, whether he may rank as a genius or merely as a person of talent, finds it easy to disregard his convictions if he does not possess true character. It is a self-evident fact that today dozens of German professors are easily changing their own theories and convictions for those of the ruling Nazi party. They put forward theories and defend them, although they run counter to their own basic convictions. For example, the theory which suggests the superiority of the German race, the theory which calls for the examination of blood to find out whether a person is Aryan or not, is put into practice by quite a number of professors who in their hearts must know that all this is sheer nonsense. They acquiesce in all this because of the power which is held over them. Sciences

which obey laws and regulations are not true sciences at all, but are merely politics, the politics of evil.

Dozens, perhaps hundreds, of German professors have changed their scientific convictions and are teaching in line with the orders received from the authoritarian government of Germany. This is an instance of persons who possess no true character. A person who possesses character could not act like that. On the other hand, there are other German professors who possess character and who resign from their office and lead a life of poverty or emigrate abroad. There are many German professors in London and New York. They go there because they are not able to cast aside their true scientific convictions in order to obey the Führer. But the majority of them continue to live in Germany, showing that they have no true character.

This is not something which is only happening just now, but it happened just the same in the war from 1914-1918. During that period there was an announcement which was signed by dozens of famous and clever men, and this announcement was intended for the eyes of the entire world. It was an announcement which declared the superiority of the German race and the intrinsic badness of Frenchmen. One of the surprises was that the declaration had been signed by Prof. Brentano, a famous economics historian at that time. There were two French economists who were just unable to believe that their friend Brentano had appended his signature at his own free will. They could only suspect that he had been forced to sign. For this reason they entered into correspondence with Brentano. The correspondence developed into a tremendous discussion because Brentano adduced strong reasons in defence of the declaration. This discussion by correspondence was published later on in the review *Journal des Economistes*. Nevertheless, after the war, Brentano surprisingly wrote a letter to Charles Gide, a French economist with whom he had relationships, to say that his signature to the declaration was not one which he had given by his own free will, but was the result of intimidation by Schmoller, the economist, who held a position of very great authority at that time in Germany. He claimed that Schmoller had forced him to give his signature and that the contents of the declaration only became known to him after it had been published.

The Brentano case is told by Suranyi Unger in his book on economic history as one of the bases of his theory that economic history does not follow exactly the progress of thought, but varies

according to the country concerned. He claims that the psychological background and life of the nation exerts a very considerable influence on the ideals of a person, especially on his philosophical mode of life. The conduct of the German professors who adduced strong reasons in support of something which they themselves acknowledged was untrue is called by Unger *Kleinmutig* (fainthearted). These German experts, in their capacity as persons of talent, were able cleverly to adduce strong reasons in support of something. But it was their bad character or lack of character which caused them to use their intelligence for setting out such strong arguments to defend the guilty, arguments which ran absolutely counter to their own deep convictions. That is why later on Hitler and his henchmen were able so easily to use them as their tools. Why is it possible for intelligent persons and educated men to be ruled and controlled as though they were slaves? Because in actual fact the universities of Germany do not educate persons with an aim at developing their character, but merely educate them with a view to producing learned persons. In everything they do, it is discipline and obedience which is stressed. This is the Prussian system, the system of educating men and women to obey authority. There is nothing higher than the authority of the person in government. The person who is most highly esteemed in this system is the person who is most susceptible to discipline. Character is only regarded as a burden. In the students' free time they are taught fencing. Right from top to bottom, everyone is educated to serve his own ego.

What is happening now to Germany, the country of Kant, Goethe and Schiller and other great men? Because the scientists and men of knowledge at the time of Hitler possess no character, their scientific value is not worth a brass button. If we compare the writings of the great men before the time of Hitler and then after Hitler came into power, we will see that there is a tremendous gulf between the two groups of great men. It may well be that in the technical and physical sciences, Germany has risen to a higher level than in the past, owing to the demands made by the necessities of war, but as regards social sciences and culture, Germany has definitely fallen to a lower level.

The general lesson to be drawn from all these instances is that genius and talent are useless if the person concerned does not pospossess character. It is character which is of the greatest importance, and not intelligence. Intelligence and knowledge can be

gained by a man having character, simply by studying. Consequently because of people of character, it is possible for the sciences to develop. A man who possesses true character is brave enough to accept responsibility and will dare to reject any authorities which conflict with his deep convictions. For this reason he is brave enough to engage in a struggle, to oppose traditions if necessary, he will dare to have his own opinion and will speak out his thoughts without fear. The convictions of a man are stronger when he is a man of character.

Especially to us Indonesians, who foster high ideals regarding our nation and our native country, the development of character is a matter of the greatest importance. The place for developing character is not merely at university, but also in our schools, mosques, place of work and more especially still, in the home. The education of a child must start with the training given to him by his own parents. If this first training is good and strong, all that is left for further education to do is to strengthen the early precepts.

But we are not concerned solely with the education of children. It is also left to us to educate ourselves. We must try to do this by self-criticism and self-correction. The main basis in character training is that of loving truth and daring to confess guilt. We know that for most people in our society, as a result of the traditional conditions in which they find themselves and as a result of the weakness of their own heart it is very difficult to achieve character training. For generations our people have been taught what is more or less a diplomatic way of life. When mistakes have been made, this does not have to be admitted direct, but in order to get the master's sympathy it has to be explained in euphemistic terms. If the master behaves badly, this must be explained in terms of goodness. Our people seem to have been trained to behave with overcompensation in all things. We know of many people, and we have seen them, even leaders of the people, who are afraid to face the enemy. But once the enemy has disappeared from sight they will strut forth and act as brave men and revolutionary patriots.

Behaviour of this kind can exert a very strong influence on our lives. At the very least, it means that what we are using as the basic principle of life is not honesty but deceitfulness. If we lead our lives after this fashion, this will not train the character of our children. Therefore if we wish to reach success in character training in those who are to follow us, we have to cast aside anything that is wrong in our traditional way of life. We must educate our-

selves and our children on the basic precept of 'loving truth and being brave enough to acknowledge when we are wrong'. If we make a mistake, we must be prepared to admit it. We must not feel ashamed in front of others to do so, nor should we get any feeling of humiliation. The same must be said about our convictions or opinions. If an opinion which we used to hold is found not to be true after we have carefully thought about it and analysed it, we must not be afraid to say that we were wrong. We must not adduce dishonest reasons to try and hide the mistake, which is something we often see in the behaviour of many persons around us. We must not seek to get out of the situation by saying something like 'Things have changed now'. If, on the other hand, you still stick to the old opinion, which you think still holds good, don't be afraid to defend your opinion when you are assailed by all sorts of confused ideas, which may turn out to be dangerous to your life.

To conclude my article, I would like to set out once again the motto with which I started the article, and which I obtained from a statement made by Prof. J. Goudriaan to the students of the University of Delft when he was inducted as Associate Professor in Management at the University in the year 1936.

'And if you ask me: What is the origin of the courage which we find so remarkable? The origin of the great and lasting courage which can fill a whole life is to be found in the love of a great ideal, greater and more long-lasting than we are ourselves.'

First published in *Pemandangan*, 1941.

37 Message to the Chinese Group Conference

It was a matter of great joy to me to be invited to say a few words at the opening of this conference which will be discussing matters connected with the position of the Chinese group in the Republic of Indonesia.

In point of fact the position of the Chinese in Indonesia does give rise to a number of difficulties, difficulties which must be overcome by the government of the Republic of Indonesia and by the Chinese group themselves. The difficulties with which we are faced are all the outcome of the history of the past, a history involving the colonial policy of the Netherlands. The present government of the Republic of Indonesia has received these problems in the form of an unfortunate heritage and would wish to solve the problems on the basis of the ideals which have formed the foundation of the government of the new state.

As everyone knows, the State of the Republic of Indonesia is founded on five basic precepts:

1. Belief in one God
2. Humanity
3. The unity of Indonesia
4. Representational democracy
5. Social justice.

The very structure of the constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which forms the guidelines for the government of the State, is based on these five precepts.

It is not the place here to discuss in detail the meaning and contents of the five basic principles. It is sufficient for us to remember at this point that the main guidance which is given to the government of the State is based on belief in one God and on humanity.

The fact that the foundation of the State is based on belief in one God will enable us to avoid the disputes which can lead to so many disasters, because in the hand of God one can achieve the

unity of human desires. Following this principle leads the aims of our State into the path of international peace and the brotherhood of all nations. If every nation felt that it was subject to the guidance of the one God in its way of life, the ideals of all nations would fit in with the main characteristics of God, which are love, mercy and justice. It is these very ideals of brotherly love and a sense of justice which form the basis of relationships between the nations of the world. It is on this basis that the nations of the world can learn to help one another. The desire on the part of one nation to conquer another is a sin in the eyes of God and will exist no more. Consequently in this way it will be possible to build proper relationships between the nations of the world, based on eternal peace.

The basic principle of humanity is very closely bound up with the basic principle of belief in one God. Since belief in one God places all human beings on the same level, the basic principle of humanity demands that a way of life be sought which promotes the well-being of the human race. In all the struggles and vicissitudes of life we must ever be mindful of human conditions and human aims and not restrict ourselves to material things.

The prosperity and well-being of mankind must be promoted at all times. In all our relationships, even when we are thinking of the inmates of prisons, we must never forget that we have to consider our attitude to them as human beings. Even in business companies it is possible to express a relationship with people who are performing public services. So long as man is considered as a creature of God, each individual is no longer free to think only of his own needs and to oppress others.

Belief in one God and humanity are the twin pillars in the foundation for the construction of the States of Indonesia. These moral principles are a real demand on our lives and they must be obeyed by all responsible persons.

Having once based its attitudes on belief in one God and in humanity, the State government is bound to stake its success on the ideal of social justice in society. For this reason social justice has been named as the fifth principle in the constitution of the State of the Republic of Indonesia.

It is possible for a nation to hold the ideal of social justice in international relationships. But in this case the success of such an ideal depends also on the goodwill of all nations. On the other hand, social justice in society itself can be put into effect by every nation by itself. The state of the Republic of Indonesia has an over-

whelming desire to succeed in doing this. This can be seen set out in the aims and the principles of the constitution, in Chapters 33 and 27, paragraph 2.

The 33rd Chapter of the Constitution states as follows:

'The economy of the country is built up in the terms of a cooperative effort based on the principle of human relations'.

'The main branches of production, which are of the greatest importance to the Government, and which fulfill the needs of the public, must be owned by the State'.

'The land and water and the natural products contained in them must be owned by the State and must be used for the maximum prosperity of the people'.

It will be quite clear from this that this Chapter is based on the idea of collectivism, leading towards prosperity and happiness for all people. The idea is to meet the needs of society rather than merely personal needs. The 33rd Chapter opposes individualism and capitalism.

Chapter 27, paragraph 2, states as follows:

'Every citizen is entitled to carry on his work and to live his life in a manner which gives satisfaction to humanity'.

In this Chapter the obligation is placed on the State government to guarantee the security of livelihood for the people. Every citizen is entitled to a job, because jobs are the source of livelihood. Furthermore, he is entitled to a good human life. His life must be a bright one, life accompanied by hope! This in turn provides one of the foundations of the social constitution, which governs the work carried out by the Ministry of Welfare.

The principle of social justice, which is the main foundation of the State of the Republic of Indonesia, provides a guarantee that any member of the population who is not a citizen will be provided for on the basis of humanity. Every type of people which supports the basic principles of the State must be properly provided for. In the future, when the Republic has overcome all its initial difficulties, there will be no people in the whole of Indonesia who are suffering from hunger. Whether citizens of the State or not, members of the population who obey the laws of the State must be guaranteed a livelihood. This again is one of the further outworkings of the basic principle of the belief in one God, humanity and social justice.

Consequently, the Constitution relating to citizenship of the Indonesian State has a very clear and simple principle. Every citizen

has his own position in the Constitution and 'must obey the laws of the land and the government without exception'. Fundamentally the Republic of Indonesia recognises all people of mixed race as full citizens except those who do not wish it. We do not draw any distinction between pure bred citizens and citizens of mixed race. It is, of course, true that in the present situation during a time of revolution it often happens that there are political differences which exist in practice and which are brought about by psychological factors. But once we have succeeded in obtaining understanding between the Indonesian groups and the groups of mixed race, once the confusion in the psychological factors has disappeared, the real principle of 'equality' will be carried into living practice.

One of the foundations of the State of the Republic of Indonesia is a united Indonesia. This principle is concerned not only with the unity of the country, the nation and the language, but also with a single and united idea of citizenship.

Anyone who wishes to assess the political form of government of the Republic of Indonesia on a proper footing should not seek his experience in the temporary events which occur in a time of confusion, in a time of psychological confusion, but he must look at the basic principles and the spirit of the Constitution of the State of the Republic of Indonesia. In this Constitution it is obligatory to all citizens to help the Government to overcome the many difficulties and obstacles which stand in its way.

I have said that the Chinese group have often created difficulties for the government of the Republic of Indonesia. On the other hand, the Chinese have often suffered many bad experiences as a result of the situations which obtained in the past.

During the days of Dutch colonialism, the Chinese group could be said to constitute the middle group between the ruling Dutch group and the colonised Indonesian group. The Chinese group represented the middle-class group and therefore constitutes a continuation of foreign capitalism in Indonesian society. In the struggle which went on between the colonising power and the colonised people, the Chinese group generally took up a neutral position, showing that their main intention was to seek their own advantage. The Chinese living in this country generally belong to the commercial classes – they are mainly merchants. In the capitalist structure, the aim of the merchant is to get the greatest advantage for himself. And because of the fact that Chinese merchants have come to be regarded as a continuation of foreign capitalism in

Indonesian society, there has been created an inherent dislike of the Chinese group.

Also during the three and a half years of the Japanese occupation, it was observed that the Chinese tried to get themselves at all times into a favourable position. The Japanese were capable of controlling everything and they made use of the Chinese as their instruments. It is true that the Chinese themselves experienced many troubles as the instruments of the Japanese, but nevertheless they managed to keep their economic position still on top.

It is for this reason that there is still a feeling of dislike for the Chinese, a feeling which tends to become stronger. Often we hear people lamenting 'The Chinese are always in a good position. During the time of the Dutch colony, they were on top. During the Japanese occupation they were still on top. If the Japanese come to power, they will be protected by the Nanking government. If the Allies win, they will be protected by the Chungking government'. These are the feelings as expressed by the ordinary, every-day Indonesian.

It is this feeling which often creates hostility between the Indonesians and the Chinese. In peacetime these feelings of hostility can be avoided and abolished. You yourselves know the serious efforts which the government of the Republic of Indonesia made right from the beginning to create a feeling of brotherhood between the Indonesian people and the Chinese people. At first they were to some extent successful. But after the Dutch return to take control of Indonesia and after the considerable amount of fighting, when many Chinese were used as tools of the Dutch, either as policemen or as merchants, the anger against the Chinese rose again to such an extent that hostile action was taken against them. In particular I can say that the government of the Republic of Indonesia expresses its sincere regret for the incidents which have been experienced by the Chinese. We must not forget that the group whose desire it is to destroy the Republic of Indonesia was the group which instigated the people to fight against the Chinese, especially around the battlefield. Foolish people and emotional people tend to get swept away by the provocation of the enemy. Because, let us face it, the aim of the enemy is to ensure that the Republic of Indonesia has a bad reputation in the matter of international relationships, the reputation of a nation which is unable to guarantee the security of foreigners residing in its territory. Because of the actions of these people, there are counter-actions on

the part of the Chinese, especially in the regions ruled by the Allies. Consequently the relationships between the Indonesian and the Chinese people becomes confused and this in turn makes difficulties for the government.

We are fully aware of this situation. It is not necessary to keep it in existence. Under the protection of the Constitution we must make all the necessary investigations so as to find out all the various reasons which are at the bottom of this situation so that we can find a remedy which will solve the problem and create an atmosphere of prosperity and goodwill.

Perhaps I should clearly explain here that it is my conviction that it is impossible to reach a true solution to the 'Chinese Problem' within the economic structure of capitalist colonialism nor within the politics of liberalism. In the capitalist colonial structure, the Chinese group are the wheel of the class struggle, which will feel every stress of the differences in the nation. Consequently the feeling of dislike for the Chinese will become stronger.

But now we have a new structure, a new economic structure based on social prosperity. The economic life of the country will no longer be controlled by the private employers themselves, but must be coordinated by the Government and this in turn will create an ordered structure. The Government possesses full authority in regard to the coordination of production and the distribution of the goods which are produced.

If the Chinese here can adapt themselves to fit in with the spirit of the new economy which forms the basis of the economy of the Republic of Indonesia, their position in the economy of Indonesia can be different from what it has been in the past. The Chinese and the Indonesians will no longer oppose one another. Even their economic powers can be coordinated by the Indonesian economic authority. The Chinese will cease to be an opposing party and will become a partner. In this way the 'Chinese Problem' will have disappeared.

The Chinese who live here can generally speaking be classified into two groups. The first group consists of those who are citizens of the Republic of Indonesia. In the second place, we have those who are foreigners, who still regard themselves as fully Chinese.

As citizens of the Republic of Indonesia, the Chinese group will obtain the same positions and the same rights as native Indonesians, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 27 of the Principles of the Constitution of the Republic. In regard to the distribu-

tion of employment and the rational application of power, Chinese who are citizens of the Republic of Indonesia will get jobs and positions solely in accordance with their ability and intelligence. This does not constitute a problem, even though the Republic of Indonesia is now in need of manpower. Every employable person in our society will be made use of and placed in work in a rational manner. These conditions will not only hold good in respect of the Chinese, but also will apply to all citizens of Dutch and Arab origin.

As regards Chinese who refrain from becoming citizens of the Republic, the Republic which is based on a sense of social justice will be acting rather like the head of a family who shows a courteous and honourable attitude to visitors. There are still many obstacles of a political nature and there are still many difficulties in the way of solving these problems. But our strong desire for goodwill will be bound to succeed in the future.

Gentlemen of the Chinese group who are holding this Conference, I wish to state to you in all honesty that I am fully aware that your discussions may exert a great influence on the present situation. You are free to criticise the position as you find it, because the democracy of Indonesia is ready to accept criticism. It is because we can accept criticism that there is a chance of improvements being carried out.

But, if you wish to make criticisms, you must also point out the path which must be taken in order to improve the conditions in order to reach more quickly the basic ideals of the Republic of Indonesia.

At any rate I hope and pray that the Conference will produce opinions which will serve as a guide to the government of the Republic of Indonesia in helping it to succeed in achieving the social prosperity for all classes and all groups of people.

Jogjakarta, 17th September 1946.

38 Indonesian aims and ideals

Now that World War Two has come to an end, the peoples of all lands look forward to a just and durable peace.

This most destructive of all wars has exacted terrific toll from a suffering world. The deathrate runs into millions; property destroyed totals astronomical figures; and ruined cities are numbered by the thousand.

Yet, in the very midst of the war, there arose in men's minds the vision of a better world for the future, of a world so ordered and arranged that it would afford the common man every opportunity to lead a full life.

World War One, which raged from nineteen fourteen to nineteen eighteen, saw the birth of a new idea summed up in the word 'self-determination'. The author of that idea was the late President Woodrow Wilson. That concept took firm root in the minds of the subject peoples, and it was on this central issue that they based their struggle for freedom. World War One also saw the birth of the 'League of Nations' in response to the human race for an organization that would help preserve enduring peace.

This six-year old war just concluded saw history repeat itself. Both sides proclaimed high ideals; but it was the 'Atlantic Charter' which succeeded in holding all men's minds in thrall.

For, does not the 'Atlantic Charter' carry the solemn assurance of the Big Powers that they 'recognize the right of all peoples to live under a government of their own choice'? The Charter further guarantees to all men in all lands the opportunity to live in peace, in order that they may have economic security and freedom from fear.

To put it briefly, the war did not succeed in putting out the flame of justice and humanity which burnt brightly in the hearts of mankind. The universal desire was to make it the war to end all wars by ushering into the world an era based on justice and humanity. Men of all nations wanted lasting peace, prosperity for the

whole world and freedom for every country. They wanted to make it possible for all peoples to be rid of the evils of oppression and exploitation.

The Indonesian struggle for independence is four decades old, and is the outcome of a long period of alien rule. Therefore, in common with the rest of the world, Indonesians regard the end of the war as the beginning of their national existence as a free people. And with that end in view, we Indonesians have taken all the steps needed to set ourselves up as a free people in a free country.

The war ended just as Indonesians were putting the finishing touch to their structure for independence as outlined in a modern constitution. The new state will be a republic based on the sovereignty of the people, in keeping with the well-established political movements current in this country. The Indonesians are opposed to all forms of autocratic or fascist rule, as evidenced by their constitution which places the emphasis on full freedom for all. This constitution makes the Grand National Assembly the custodian of vast powers. The Grand National Assembly chooses the President and makes him answerable to it. And, in turn the Grand National Assembly is answerable to all elements in the Indonesian life: to the villager in his desa; to the town dweller; to the cooperative societies; to the trade-unions; to the universities and colleges; to the country's cultural bodies and so forth. Further, the President will be assisted by a council of ministers, and the relationship between them will closely follow the pattern now obtaining in the United States of America.

Indonesians are desirous of building up the national life on a firms basis of mutual cooperation in order that there be full social security, what we Indonesians want to bring into existence in a 'cooperative Common-wealth'.

All these aspirations of ours find their place in the constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

We know that the first requisite of a free country is a stable government, and we Indonesians have the capacity and resources to fulfill that prerequisite. In fact, the skeleton structure of such a government is already in Indonesian hands. This was made possible during the occupation of this country by the Nipponese, for they transferred to Indonesian hands the majority of key-posts formerly held by Dutch officials. The work of the Preparatory Committee for Indonesian independence includes the further transfer of the remaining key-posts.

The final phase of the transfer of all power to Indonesian hands coincides with the end of the war. For our part, we fervently welcome the return of peace, for it is only in times of peace that we can put into operation plans for the wellbeing of the people. And it is only in times of peace that Indonesia can contribute her share to the wealth and progress of the world.

It is with all this in mind that we appeal to the world powers, who are now determining the future world structure, to approve of Indonesia's independence. We are ready to receive help and guidance from the International Body entrusted with the safeguarding of world peace; and we are anxious to give of our manpower and of our country's material wealth towards the building up of world prosperity. But do grant us the right to self-determination, do give us the opportunity to live under a government of our own choice and of a form suited to our national needs. Only under such conditions can the Indonesian people live in security in their own land; only under such conditions can Indonesia play her allotted role in world security and world brotherhood.

The coming world order must aim at a just world in keeping with the hopes and aspirations of all the nations which suffered in this war; it must also be a world founded on the principles guaranteed by Atlantic Charter. Because of all these factors, we Indonesians have absolute confidence that the world powers will deal with our case justly and fairly. Therefore we say to you with all the emphasis at our command: 'Grant us the right to exist as a free nation, the right to live and work together with other nations on a basis of absolute equality'.

August 23rd, 1945.

39 A personal message to my old comrades wherever they may be

World war two has at last come to an end, and soon men of many nations will find themselves engaged in the task of hammering out a peace based on new ideals and new conceptions. In these circumstances my mind goes back to my days in Europe and to my many friends there, who stood shoulder to shoulder with me in our common struggle. Those comrades are at present scattered over the face of the globe. Yet, during all these years, I have treasured their memory in my heart, and I now look forward to getting in touch with them once more.

This message of mine I chiefly direct to those leaders of movements and those champions of humanitarianism who participated in those two conferences so fraught with world importance – the International Democratic Congress held at Bierville in August of 1926, and the Anti-colonial League Congress at Brussels during February of the following year.

In these two conferences we achieved complete unity of thought regarding the basis of a permanent peace and the brotherhood of nations. With one voice we agreed that dominations of one people by another should be abolished, we further decided that the relationship between all races should be on a footing of equality, because only in such a world it would be possible for mankind to bring into being the ideal of the brotherhood of nations.

Since then some of you have discharged heavy responsibilities in your respective countries and, by serving as leaders of labour movements and of trade-unions, by assuming office as ministers and diplomats, you have helped to shape and influence the course of world politics and to give it peaceful bias. Relying on your sincere service to the cause of world progress, I call upon you now to use your utmost endeavours to help bring about a world order based on a just social system which will allow nations, hitherto oppressed, to realize their hopes and longings for a free national existence.

It was full thirteen years ago that I departed from you to return to my native country. When I came here I threw myself into the struggle of my people for independence and, in consequence, I have spent the greater part of these thirteen years either in prison or in exile.

About three and a half years ago my country ceased to exist as a Dutch colony and the Japanese held sway over these islands for a short while. Yet not for one moment did I deviate from my lifelong desire to see the establishment of a free Indonesia.

As the war was drawing to its close, we Indonesians had simultaneously arrived at the end of preparations for our independence. However, the abruptness with which hostilities ceased, made it impossible for the Japanese to recognize officially our independence, as they would have done in the normal course of events. Therefore, on the 17th of August last, we Indonesians gave expression to the will of the nation by declaring our independence. By doing so we made evident our resolve to live as a free people, for only as an independent nation will it be possible for us to live as a component member of the world brotherhood of nations. We have suffered colonial rule for so many centuries that we will have no more of it.

Therefore I appeal to you, my old comrades, to stand by us and to use your influence to see that the independence of Indonesia is recognized by those world powers now engaged in the task of bringing about world peace.

In the past, when we were comrades in the common fight for the realization of the principles of humanity and justice, you threw your whole heart and soul into the struggle for Indonesian independence. Today you sit in high positions wielding much power. Now, then, it is the time for you to give us the assistance we seek. By doing so you will see the fulfilment of your own visions.

There is one thing, however, to which I must draw your attention so that there may be no misunderstanding about what has taken place in Indonesia. Please remember that, although the Japanese were in power at the time we planned and discussed the form and shape of the Free Indonesian state, we did not in any way copy Japanese principles or ideas. We deliberately choose the type of political structure we had advocated and demanded for the past fifteen years, namely, a republic based on the sovereignty of the people.

I address this appeal to you in the name of the seventy million people of Indonesia, and I have the utmost confidence that you my

comrades – in view of our common aims and ideals and of our past friendship – will do all that lies in your power to make this Indonesia of my people a free nation.

August 30th, 1945.

40 On the road to transfer of sovereignty

The fact that we are now sitting around this round table is proof that every party must have been convinced that this conference would achieve its objective, namely the unconditional transfer of complete and real sovereignty over Indonesia to the Indonesian people. Now finally, after four years of negotiations and battles in which not a few lives and goods were lost which were so urgently needed for the reconstruction of society and its production, it is realised that it is of the utmost importance to put a stop to the present conflict without delay. The bitter experiences of the past have proved that the only solution to the Indonesian problem lies in the immediate transfer of sovereignty. The history of negotiations in the past has taught us that the basic problem lies in the matter of sovereignty.

The sovereignty of Holland over Indonesia is based on history. But since the Indonesian independence proclamation of the 17th August 1945, which was solemnly announced to the world as an expression of the right of the Indonesian people to determine their own fate, the Indonesian people has felt itself to be sovereign.

The great change in mentality of the Indonesian people was originally very difficult for foreigners who had only known the Indonesia of before the second world war to understand. Not only the masses in Holland, but also the scholars and politicians, who should be capable of seeing ahead could not understand that 'the meekest people on earth' had become a rebellious nation, full of aggression. They could not break away from the mistaken idea that the independence of Indonesia was an exclusive creation of some demagogic leaders. They neglect to make a searching and serious enquiry that could prove that the proclamation of the 17th August 1945 was the realisation of the ideals of the Indonesian national movement which has existed for more than 40 years. The unspeakably severe suffering under Japanese rule

has only strengthened the 'mau merdeka', *the will for freedom.*

As a result of that misunderstanding a psychological conflict arose right from the start between the Dutch people and the people of Indonesia, a conflict that became the source of the tragedy which we witnessed for four years. I call it a tragedy, because basically our objective is the same, namely the independence of Indonesia. Only with respect to the way of carrying this out is there a difference of opinion and this has caused many clashes.

However emphatically the Dutch government produces legal arguments that the sovereignty over Indonesia lies in the hands of the kingdom of the Netherlands, the Indonesian people of the republic is of the opinion and feels that its state is sovereign. It has its own government which is not subject to any other government. It has its own army and its own police force to maintain law and order, it has its own monetary system and last but not least it has its own foreign policy and representation abroad which is increasing in strength every day and enters into closer diplomatic relationships with other countries. All this is felt as proof of sovereignty, which is difficult to talk people out of. The more time passed, the more the people get accustomed to a life of freedom and sovereignty, the more difficult it will be to lose independence. Rightly or wrongly, recognized or not, the Indonesian people in the republic regards itself as living in a sovereign state. The more so since the actual authority of the Republic of Indonesia over Java, Mandura and Sumatra was already recognized after the Linggadjati Agreement, not only by the Kingdom of the Netherlands, but also by great powers such as England, the United States and some other countries.

It is for that reason that every agreement so far, such as the Linggadjati Agreement and the Renville principles, has failed in its execution because one could not find a practical solution to the question of sovereignty. The Dutch are of the opinion that as long as sovereignty has not been transferred to the Indonesian people, the sovereignty is still completely in the hands of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The Indonesians are of the opinion that every transition period must show the characteristics of a transition from the colonial status to the position of an independent state and that is why the government system in such a transition period must already have as many characteristics as possible of the government of the independent state which is their goal. And this is why in that case various rights and responsibilities could be assigned to the provisional Indonesian government by the Dutch government. In

order to achieve the independence of Indonesia over an interim period, the Republic was prepared to make a sacrifice, namely to give up its sovereignty in order to become a part of the Dutch empire on an equal footing. But it insisted that in this case all its attributes of sovereignty, such as the army and foreign affairs, should be continued by the interim government. In theory sovereignty during the transition period would lie in the hands of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, but the practical execution of it would in many respects be left to the provisional government. The Indonesians felt that this conception is in accordance with the contents of the Renville principles (article 1 of the 6 additional articles). This conception of the Indonesians gave rise to the problem of the division of responsibility between the Dutch High Commissioner in Indonesia and the interim government, on which they could not reach an agreement. And it was this problem that made all negotiations fail and which caused armed conflict twice.

All this indicates that an interim period creates various problems which are difficult to overcome, so that there is only one alternative left to solve the Indonesian question, namely the transfer of sovereignty without an interim period. If I am not mistaken, such an immediate transfer of sovereignty has already been accepted in general in Dutch political circles as an inevitable consequence, and if sovereignty is transferred to the Indonesian people anyway, then it would be best to complete the transfer as soon as possible and to wind up the negotiations of the Round Table Conference concerning the transfer in as short a time as possible.

The Indonesian Dutch conflict is mainly *psychological* matter, which originates in colonial history and furthermore was complicated by the psychological conflict of the last four years. For that reason, every period which means a delay in transfer of sovereignty, after achieving an agreement, is felt by the Indonesian people as political manoeuvre to maintain colonial power in Indonesia and as a result of this distrust with regard to Dutch intentions will increase. A lasting cooperation cannot be founded on the basis of distrust. In the future cooperation between Indonesia and Holland can only be permanent if it is founded on mutual understanding and mutual trust. And that is why one of our main objectives is the disappearance of the feeling of distrust and the strengthening of the will to understanding and cooperation. And that is why anything that can create distrust should be avoided.

The transfer of sovereignty is not entirely unconditional either.

We know that the Dutch government insists that sovereignty be transferred to a Federal Indonesia and that between Republik Indonesia Serikat (Republic of United States of Indonesia) and the Kingdom of the Netherlands a union be formed, in accordance with the Renville principle. Since the Indonesians, both the Republic and the B.F.O. agreed with the federal form and foundation of the Dutch-Indonesian Union, these conditions are not felt as restrictions of sovereignty. Since the Linggadjati Agreement the Republic agreed to the foundation of a Federation and recently this has been confirmed again in the decisions of the Inter-Indonesian Conference.

The union will consist of two states, which will both be sovereign and equal. Neither of the two parties will make more concessions to the Union than the other. In that way the Union will be a free association between two sovereign states. The first condition for the Union is that it will not restrict the absolute and real sovereignty which will be transferred to the Republik Indonesia Serikat.

The conception of a Union as a 'superstate', as was suggested in the past at Kaliurang by the Dutch government, had a great psychological influence on the Indonesian people, and created the fear that Holland would use the Union to conceal its intention to retain the imperial authority. It is very satisfactory that the Dutch government and its delegation at Lake Success in Djakarta have confirmed several times that Holland does not aim at the ideal of a Union in the form of a 'superstate'.

Since we know that this Union question – because of its history – greatly influenced the psychology of the masses, we must be extremely careful in the establishment of its structure and the manner of its formation. The Union must be a voluntary association, not rigid in structure and stipulations. For if the objective of the Union is really a close and lasting cooperation between Holland and Indonesia then it is essential not to make the structure too rigid and too binding, which could easily lead to bad feelings in practice. That would take us further from our goal. If the Union is really a voluntary association between two states which are both independent and equal, then every rigid bond will naturally break, because people will not abide by it. And every regulation which has fallen into disuse is doomed to death. It is even not without danger if a regulation is felt as an enforcement by the other partner. A voluntary association for lasting cooperation cannot be enforced; it must be accepted in complete voluntariness. Every bond that is

felt as enforced will create resistance, in this case the urge to break the enforced bond.

That is why in the formation of the Union wisdom and far-sightedness is needed, lest the contents of the goal are sacrificed to the form.

I know that many people in Holland fear that Dutch capital and the Dutch economic interest in Indonesia will be endangered when Indonesia becomes independent and sovereign. This fear shows an attitude and policy, which looks back to the past and which tries to retain what it should already have returned, which will aggravate the psychological conflict. It played its part in the rise of the confrontation which ended in the armed conflict that in fact they wanted to avoid. Production, which should have been increased, was stopped to a large extent; the means of production were destroyed by a scorched-earth policy. Instead of directing their efforts to production for the benefit of the whole world which is short of goods and raw material, they concentrated on destruction.

How much better it would have been if they had come to an agreement right from the start about transfer of sovereignty! The cooperation between Indonesia and Holland would already have been a fact, the increased production have started and capital as well as other means of production not have been wasted!

There is little sense in holding a post mortem on the history which lies behind us. 'Nasi telah mendjadi bubur' – what is done cannot be undone. And as we know, the attitude in the past was such that everything which happened was determined by their own psychological standards.

The fear that Netherlands capital and economic interest in Indonesia will be endangered if Indonesia becomes independent is completely unfounded. In the Political Manifesto of the Government of Indonesia of the 1st November 1945 it was declared clearly that these interests would be guaranteed. The passage concerned reads as follows:

'We know and are fully aware that for our country and people for many years to come we shall need aid from foreign peoples for building up our country, from technicians and intellectuals, as well as foreign capital.

In fulfilling these needs we shall not overlook the fact that people who speak Dutch, i.e. Netherlanders, will probably be in much greater demand because they are already there and are more used to the situation in this country. Owing to this the achievement of

our independence need not mean a great loss to the Dutch if measured by capital employed or personnel, but naturally it will bring with it an enormous change in political status.
We are convinced that our rich country, if used in earnest to raise the living standard of our people as well as that of the world in general, will still be able to offer a great deal of places to forces from the whole world over, particularly from the United States of America, Australia and the Philippines, to work with us in the building up of our country and the development of our people.
But in all this a start can only be made if the dispute over sovereignty between the Netherlands and ourselves had been settled with the recognition of our right to self-government, viz. with the acknowledgement of the State and Government we ourselves have chosen. Not we alone but perhaps also the Dutch have an interest in the speedy achievement of this, but also the whole world which after all is awaiting the contribution of the Indonesian land and people towards relieving the want which exists in the world at the moment. With the acknowledgment of our independence we shall carry full responsibility for all that we are made responsible for according to our status. The whole debt of the Netherlands Indies before the capitulation of Japan and which reasonably is our responsibility, we shall recognise as our own debt.
All property belonging to foreigners, with the exception of what the State itself will need to exploit, will be restored to the owners with the understanding that fair compensation will be given for what has been taken over by the State.'

Up to now the standpoint of the Government of the Republic has not undergone any change.

In the Netherlands one should be able to foresee with one dynamic glance that an independent and sovereign Indonesia will bring not disadvantage but in the long run advantage to the people of Holland. In particular collaboration between Indonesia and Holland in the economic field should be able to be arranged in such a way that the building up of Indonesia according to a plan during decades to come can be coordinated with the development of new industries in the Netherlands, which will be able to fulfil Indonesia's needs for various goods and means of production.

In one respect Dutch capital may indeed have to record losses. The new policy requires from the government a welfare policy for the people, which may result in a future reduction in profit on the capital by division of the proceeds. Independent Indonesia will no

longer be a 'native colony' as formerly, supplying coolies at a low wage rate. The new independent Indonesia will demand a 'living wage' and 'social security' for the worker, such as is the case in all civilised countries, in accordance with the fourth of the freedom principles of the late President Roosevelt, i.e. 'freedom for want'. But a prosperous Indonesia with a healthy purchasing power in the long run will not mean a loss to the outside world, and especially not for the Netherlands; on the contrary it will pay dividends.

The transfer of sovereignty by the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Republic Indonesia Serikat will go hand in hand with the transfer of debts and claims, rights and obligations. This must therefore be on the agenda of the Round Table Conference. It can already be guessed that this question will present many difficult aspects and that there will be many details to settle. Dealing with this, in my opinion, must not prolong the duration of the Round Table Conference. We must limit the discussions to the main points and principles so that the Round Table Conference can be brought to a speedy end and not last longer than is psychologically justified. The details can be settled later between the Netherlands and the Republic Indonesia Serikat.

The date of the 1st January 1949 which had such a great influence on the psyche of the Indonesian people already lies well behind us. All eyes are now fixed on the *year* 1949. The transfer of sovereignty to the Indonesian people has still to be completed this year. Yet before the year 1950 begins Indonesia must already be independent, the Republic Indonesia Serikat must be constituted, equipped with complete and genuine sovereignty. This is what the mass psychology demands, and it cannot be ignored. A question of irrationalism, indeed, but it cannot be disregarded!

Mr. Chairman! It is my view that if we, who are conducting our deliberations at this Round Table seriously wish to find a solution to the Indonesian question in the form of an unconditional transfer of complete and genuine sovereignty, we ought to give our full attention to the future of our two peoples. If we indeed direct our attention to this end then I think that the difference of the opinion will be small and the goal of this Round Table Conference will quickly be achieved.

For four long years our two peoples have lived in mutual enmity and with feelings of resentment in their hearts. For four long years we have been fighting and killing each other, with vain sacrifice of property and blood.

Let us now commence a new era, founded on peace and collaboration. The Indonesian people and the people of Holland will thus achieve happiness. Our children and descendants, the future generations, will be grateful to us.

May God the Almighty give his blessings to our work at the Round Table Conference.

Speech at the Opening of the R.T.C., August 1949.

41 End of the Round Table Conference

For more than two months we have conferred with the aim of reaching an end to the conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia, and today we are able to come together at this session and solemnly to announce that our work has been crowned with good results.

This day forms an important moment in the relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands. Today we shall put our signatures to a Draft Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty.

THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS TRANSFERS COMPLETE SOVEREIGNTY OVER INDONESIA UNCONDITIONALLY TO THE REPUBLIC INDONESIA SERIKAT AND RECOGNISES SAME AS A SOVEREIGN STATE. The official transfer of sovereignty is to take place by the 30th December 1949.

Our joy is somewhat tempered by the fact that not all the problems at this Round Table Conference were able to be solved. Irian (New Guinea) is still a subject of dispute, and an attempt will be made to solve this question in the year following the transfer of sovereignty to the R.I.S.

In this historic moment the Indonesian people should feel relief. Today the disappearance of the colonial regime in Indonesia will be officially announced, and the birth of a new legal order based on the *pantja sila* (the so-called five basic principles). For four years the Republic of Indonesia has striven to get this basis recognised as a vital principle for the people of Indonesia, and today the success of this endeavour is offficially confirmed. The Republic Indonesia Serikat is to be based on the acknowledgment of Divine Omnipotence, of humanity, consciousness of nationhood, democracy and social justice.

In this way expression is given to the fact that the Indonesian people wishes to live as a people who advocate humanity, democracy and brotherhood. The Indonesian people wish to see their country not only as a constitutional state but as a cultural state.

The Indonesian people will maintain relations with other nations of the world on a basis of brotherhood so that mutual happiness and prosperity of the nations can be increased. It is also with this conviction that we, the people of Indonesia, are prepared to enter into a Union with the Netherlands, on the basis of free will and equality. As is laid down in the Statutes, this Union shall afford the opportunity for orderly collaboration between the Republic Indonesia Serikat and the Kingdom of the Netherlands on the basis of free will, equality and equal rights. This Union will not affect in the case of either country the status of an independent and sovereign state.

For us, the people of Indonesia, the significance, the sense of the Unions lies especially in the cooperation between *East* and *West*. In particular we see this Union as a creation of cultural idealism.

In what way this Union will function cannot as yet be fixed precisely. Only *practice* in international relations can teach us this. But it is clear that the Union will only be able to work well if mutual trust exists between the two parties. It is to be hoped that the manner of dealing with subjects of mutual interest (which are not few in number) will prove the usefulness of the Union.

The fact that the Round Table Conference has been able to produce the result which we are legalising today is in no small measure due to the U.N.C.I., which has continuously given its assistance. In particular at certain moments during the period which now lies behind us, when difficulties reached a peak, the U.N.C.I. showed a very sensible and wise attitude, which was greatly appreciated by both parties in the dispute.

We would like to express our thanks once more by our joy in the fact that the U.N.C.I. or another body of the United Nations Organisation is to act as observer of the carrying out of the agreement which has been reached at this Round Table Conference.

Through the mediation of the U.N.C.I. we would express our thanks, in the name of the Government and the delegation of the Republic of Indonesia, to the Security Council, which succeeded in putting an end to the dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia by a peaceful route.

Last but not least, in the name of the delegation of the Indonesian Republic I would say thank you most cordially to the Government and delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the good reception prepared for us in this country. The atmosphere during the discussion was always good even in moments when

views differed sharply from one another. At this Conference we learned to appreciate each other's point of view.

May the good atmosphere of the Round Table Conference be with us also in all negotiations which await us in the future.

Speech at the closing of the R.T.C., 2nd November, 1949.

42 Legend and reality surrounding the proclamation of 17th August

It is a very frequent phenomenon that an historic event is followed by stories and legends. Some legends grow out of pure fantasy, born of the wish to make the memory prettier than the truth was. It also often happens that a figment of the imagination grows, when it is passed round by word of mouth, and thus spreads out from a small circle to the masses at large to the point of absurdity. Other legends are brought back to life and cherished with devotion by an interested group, either for political purposes or for the greatness of the people whose history they relate to.

Every image of the past, especially where the immediate past is concerned and where the turmoils are not yet over, shows a strong mixture of 'Poetry and Truth'. That image is more imbued with colours to the wish of the brain that shapes it than it is any reflection of the reality. Herein lies the task of historical science, to separate truth from fiction.

All stories told as testimony of (unconfirmed) events must be collected and subjected to a comparative study. They must be tested by sharp logical reasoning and a critical consideration as to whether they can stand up to an investigation according to the law of causal connection. The findings of this form the basis for further investigations. An historical examination of an already analysed event can never be regarded as complete because subsequent data always contribute to a better knowledge, idea and understanding of the past. It is not the purpose of history to give a complete picture of the past, but it aims at *giving a form* to that past so that the characteristics of it will always stand out clearly before our eyes. The more details are found and the less fiction is left over from the collected facts, the closer the form of the past comes to the truth.

The proclamation of the 17th of August 1945 is a great event that was of decisive significance for the course of Indonesian his-

tory. As an historical event it certainly does not lack its string of stories and legends which, if one looks closely at them, sometimes do not tally and even conflict with each other. One of those legends is that Sukarno and Hatta would only have been ready to proclaim Indonesia's independence after being forced to do so by *Pemudas*.

According to that legend Sukarno and Hatta, because they did not wish to give in to the Pemuda's pressure to proclaim Indonesia an independent state, were taken to Rengasdengklok where they were forced to sign the proclamation of independence which was read out at 10 o'clock the following morning at Pengangsaan Timur 56.

The influence of this legend can be traced back in Muhammad Dimyati's book *Sedjarah perjuangan Indonesia*, where on page 90 the following is written:

'On the 16th of August at half past four in the morning Bung Karno and Hatta left Djakarta by car, accompanied by Sukarni and J. Kunto, driving in the direction of Rengasdengklok barracks,[1] because there was a fear that the Japanese would use them as puppets if they remained in their homes. Rengasdengklok barracks were at that time already in the hands of the Indonesian *Pemudas* who had conceived the plan to rebel against the Japanese. In that place discussions took place about an immediate declaration of independence for Indonesia. Because no agreement and unanimity could be reached the discussions were continued at midnight on the 16th of August in a building on the Nassau boulevard[2] in Djakarta. Here had gathered all the Indonesian leaders and members of the "Committee for the Preparation of Indonesia's Independence", which had then been set up by the Japanese but which had since severed all relations with the Japanese. At the time of these latter discussions Sukarni proposed a text for the proclamation of Indonesia's independence in which the following sentence was written: "The Indonesian Nation hereby declares itself independent. All existing institutions maintained by the foreigners must be taken from them".'

Such a formulation could not get the approval of the meeting, which sought a far more moderate form. Finally Sujati Melik (M.I. Sujati) was able to solve the problem by suggesting the following formulation:

'We, the Indonesian People, hereby declare the independence of Indonesia. Matters concerning the transfer of power and other things will be properly dealt with in the shortest possible time'.

Here the story has taken another turn. Sukarno and Hatta, who

had been abducted to Rengasdengklok 'because it was feared that the Japanese would use them as puppets if they remained in their homes', were *brought back to Djakarta* to resume the discussions which were not concluded at Rengasdengklok. In this short demonstration which only embraces a few sentences one can already point to absurdities. It was feared that both leaders would be used as puppets by the Japanese if they stayed at home in Djakarta; nonetheless they were brought back to Djakarta. Where is the logic of it?[3]

In this new legend Sajuti Melik appears as the one who provided the final content of the proclamation. The original document shows, however, that the proclamation was written in Bung Karno's own hand, and its syntax and style do not conform with those of Sajuti Melik!

So much for the legend surrounding the Proclamation of 17th August 1945. But what was the reality?

In contrast to Muhammad Dimyati's story, people were not at odds with each other regarding the proclamation of Indonesia's independence itself, but they did not agree about the way this should be done.

As is well known, Sukarno, Hatta and Dr. Radjiman Wedyodiningrat were invited to Dalat (Indo-China) by the Japanese supreme commander for South East Asia to be told of the Japanese government's decision regarding Indonesia's independence. At an official meeting on the 12th of August General Terauchi said:
'It is up to you to establish when Indonesia shall be independent'.

On the return journey from Dalat the above-mentioned three persons in Singapore met Mr. Teuku Hassan, Dr. Amir and Mr. Abbas, all three members of the 'Committee for the preparation of Indonesia's independence' from Sumatra, with whom they were to make the journey back to Djakarta. They had also heard the news that Russia had declared war on Japan and that Manchuria had been invaded.

After exchanging views they were convinced that Japan's defeat was no longer a question of months but only of weeks. Therefore the proclamation of Indonesia's independence must happen as soon as possible.

On arrival in Djakarta on the 14th August 1945, while he was still on Kemajoran airport, Bung Karno addressed the crowd who had come to meet him with these words: 'If I have said before that Indonesia would be independent before the corn bears fruit, I can

now assure you that Indonesia will be independent before the corn *blossoms*'.

The same afternoon Sjahrir came to tell me that Japan had sued for peace from the allies, and he asked me how things stood with our independence. I answered that that depended solely on us. Sjahrir was of the opinion that Indonesia's independence should not be proclaimed by the 'Committee for the Preparation of Indonesia's Independence' because an independent Indonesia born in this way would be branded by the allies as Japanese-made. The best thing would be for Bung Karno himself in his capacity as popular leader to read out the proclamation over the radio on behalf of the people.

Bung Karno could not agree to Sjahrir's suggestion because, as chairman of the Preparation Committee, he could not take matters into his own hands without consulting that body. He also wanted to get information from the Gunseikanbu.

When it turned out on the following day, the 15th of August, that Japan really had sued for peace, we decided to call a meeting of the Preparation Committee for 10 o'clock in the morning on the 16th of August at the Sanyo-council office at Pedjambon 2.

Indonesia's independence had to be proclaimed as quickly as possible. The constitution had to be approved without too much debate and the Indonesian central government and regional authorities must be capable of being set up within a few days. The members of the Preparation Committee who came from outside Java had to return as quickly as possible to their respective regions and take with them complete instructions from the Government of independent Indonesia. No time must be lost. If the members delayed their return could be obstructed by the Japanese, who now, after their defeat, were only in the position of the Allies' executors in Indonesia. It is true that Japan had given its approval to an independent Indonesia, but the Japanese army in Indonesia could be ordered by the Allies to suppress and liquidate Independent Indonesia. We had to bear it in mind that the Allies would try to bring Indonesia back under the Netherlands Indies authority. There had to be an organised revolution. Only then could independence be defended in a struggle fought by the whole Indonesian people.

On the basis of this conviction I rejected the theory of using Pemudas, PETA and the people to overthrow authority, as was suggested to me that afternoon by the late Subianto and the present member of parliament Subadio. The overthrow of authority would

have to be preceded by a proclamation of independence over the radio by Bung Karno. I explained to both these young people that I was for a revolution, but against a *putsch*. This statement did not satisfy them and caused them great disappointment. Subianto, who since the Japanese period was very closely related to me, as if we were father and son, became estranged from me some time because of this. But he later turned towards me again and said that he had realised that my point of view was right. Since then Subianto received important commissions from me, which he carried out well, until he died in Serpong.

At 10 o'clock in the morning of the 16th of August 1945, therefore, all the members of the Preparation Committee and some pressmen of note, who had been invited, came together at Pedjambon 2. But *not* present were . . . the *inviters*, Sukarno and Hatta, who had at 4 o'clock that morning been taken off by Sukarni to Rengasdengklok. The reason that Sukarni advanced for taking us with him was the following. Because Bung Karno did not wish to proclaim the independence of Indonesia in the way they wished to, the Pemudas, PETA and the people itself were to take action. In Djakarta a revolution would break out to seize power from the Japanese. It was necessary for Bung Karno and myself to be evacuated to Renasdengklok so that the Independent Indonesian government could be continued.

When I heard this reasoning I saw in my mind's eye the catastrophe that Indonesia would meet with materialise. This madness of the Pemudas was bound to end in a fiasco. This *putsch* would be the coup de grâce for the Indonesian revolution.

It also turned out that day that the Pemuda hotheads could not put their own theory into practice. The *putsch* did not go ahead. Outside Djakarta no preparations whatever had been made. Only the Japanese were ready, with all those organs that were still intact, to make a bold stand against any eventuality.

In Rengasdengklok not a single discussion took place. We were condemned there to a day of idleness, whilst from afar we had to witness the failure of an idea that was not based on reality. If there was a place in Indonesia, however, where a true taking of power took place it was Rengasdengklok. At the suggestion of Sukarni or of Djakarta the PETA troops stationed there arrested the operating Wedana and two or three 'Sakura' Japanese, who were in charge of rice business, and held them prisoner. By chance Sutardjo Kartohadikusumo, the Commissioner of Djakarta at that time, was that

day visiting Rengasdengklok to check on the rice supply situation, and he too was taken prisoner. This 'coup d'état' happened quietly and in an orderly fashion, so that only a few people in the locality were aware of it. A sharp-witted jurist could ask this question: For and on behalf of whom did the PETA take over the local power? Was it for and on behalf of independent Indonesia? Independent Indonesia did not yet exist on that day. Neither was there a revolutionary government.

In the afternoon Mr. Subardjo, as a delegate of the Gunseikanbu, came to fetch us. Sukarni offered no resistance. So we were back in Djakarta that evening, in company with Sutjardjo and Sukarni himself. The only legal question that arose was a question from the local PETA commandant: 'What are we to do with the Wedana we have taken prisoner?' We answered that he must be set free. That same evening the leadership of the impending revolution was once more in the hands of Sukarno and Hatta.

After midnight, after a conversation with Somubutjo had taken place, from which it appeared that Japan had indeed taken on the role of executor taking orders from the Allies, a meeting was held that was attended by the whole of the Preparation committee, representatives of the Pemudas and of a few social groupings. At the time of this meeting it was unanimously decided at the suggestion of the Pemuda group that the proclamation of independence would only be signed Sukarno and Hatta in the name of the Indonesian people.

On the 17th of August at 10 o'clock in the morning (Indonesian time) the contents of the proclamation were broadcast, followed by the hoisting of the 'Sang Merah Putih'. Pemudas, students and Indonesian officials in important communications services did their utmost to spread the contents of the proclamation to all the corners of Indonesia. The Indonesian journalists working at DOMEI sent the Indonesian proclamation of independence overseas.

The revolution was on its way!

The following day the Preparation Committee, which had meanwhile on its own initiative broadened its membership, began to lay the foundations for state government. From these actual facts it appears that the proclaiming of Indonesian independence posed no problems. The question at issue was the manner in which this could be done.

The Pemuda group in Djakarta under the name of 'Angkatan Pemuda Indonesia' (API), the students from the Medical High School (École Supérieure) and the Sjahrir group, when it became

known that Japan had surrendered, were of the opinion that the proclamation of the independence of Indonesia should happen in a 'revolutionary' manner, that is to say, free from anything that could in any way smack of Japanese manufacture. An Indonesia of Japanese making would absolutely certainly be destroyed by the Allies. The proclamation should not be made by the Preparation Committee, but by Bung Karno himself in his capacity as popular *leader*. He should make it known to the world over the radio that Indonesia had conquered her independence from Japanese authority.

In our opinion the proclamation of Indonesia's independence should come from the Preparation Committee, because this body was regarded as representing the whole of Indonesia. This body could be extended if necessary with other members who represented the various groupings of the society. Although the delegates from Java, Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Sunda Ketjil and Maluku were appointed by the Japanese, their votes, which they had used in favour of an independent Indonesia, represented the will and the ideal of the people. Their participation was the symbol of the unanimity of all Indonesia. The concept of Indonesian unity was very important for the conduct of the national revolution. And this *internal* feeling of unity was of greater importance than the *external* legal consideration as to whether this body was not after all appointed by the Japanese.

The question that we would have to watch carefully in the future did not concern the now powerless Japan, but our posture vis-à-vis the Allies, who would restore Dutch authority in Indonesia. For these reasons the preparations for revolution should not be directed against the Japanese, who already belonged in the past, but against the Dutch, who would come back to rule again.

This was the principal difference of interpretation between the Sukarno-Hatta group, which was regarded as pursuing the legal course, and the group of API, students and Sjahrir, which regarded their way as revolutionary. Indeed, from a formally legal viewpoint that position did look 'revolutionary'. From the method pursued by them it would appear that independent Indonesia was the result of its own initiative and not a Japanese product.

But if one kept sight of reality, that formally legal argument had no great meaning. A revolution takes no account of formally legal questions, but of the potentialities and forces that are present. The Dutch who wished to restore their authority in Indonesia, were not worried whether the independence was pumped in by the Japanese

or whether it was purely Indonesian. For them any revolution that sought to overthrow their power was an action directed against that power and must therefore be resisted.

One reality which could not be ignored on formally legal grounds was the fact that preparations for an independent Indonesia were already started during the Japanese period of occupation. The constitution that had been valid for five years in the Indonesian Republic was drawn up in the Japanese period by the 'Panitia Penjelidik Usaha-Usaha Kemerdekaan Indonesia', a committee charged with the examination of affairs relating to Indonesia's independence. The Preparation Committee that met after the proclamation on the 17th of August, only made a few minor alterations to it.

And even if it is true that people wanted revolutionary dealings in the true sense of the word which had no connection with the past, then the proclamation would have to be made by completely new people, whose names were not involved with cooperation with the Japanese. At the very least the proclamation should not be made by Sukarno and Hatta. The API-student-Sjahrir combination, however, could not take this on. It was not a match for the revolutionary situation which it had called into being. This was its inner weakness. It was compelled as yet to rely on Sukarno and Hatta to arrive at the revolutionary act of proclaiming Indonesian independence. Or, what Sjahrir did later, to withdraw, not to participate in the proclamation and to take no active part in political life after the proclamation, to renounce his appointment to the National Committee and to wait for the propitious time. Such a position can scarcely be called a position that gets a revolution moving, because for a revolution no time must be wasted.

The inner weakness of this combination of three that did not feel itself capable of carrying through an action that it had itself thought out, had determined right from the start the miscarriage of its subsequent actions. The API group, which was led by Sukarni, Chairul Saleh, Adam Malik and Wikana and in which Dr. Muwardi was also involved without his 'Barisan Banteng', wanted to compel Bung Karno to dance like a puppet to its pipes. It followed the tactics of browbeating and intimidation.[4] In this way it showed that it did not understand the *law of revolution*. A revolution cannot be led by a puppet. A revolution needs to be led by one or more persons who themselves carry the full responsibility. A revolution will only succeed if it is led by someone who knows what he wants,

who knows how to make the right calculations and who knows how to assess correctly the power of his opponents.

Another weakness of this combination of three was the absence of unity of purpose and of spirit. The Sjahrir group which later thought that the actions of Sukarni and his men were leading to chaos and anarchy, detached itself from this joint stand and assumed, as has been mentioned above, a waiting posture. The student group also subsequently realised that they were only being exploited by Sukarni and followers and that an untrue picture had been given to them of the political situation and the people's capacity to fight. The revolutionary-romantic and knightly heart of the Pemuda was won over by Sukarni with the declaration that on the 16th of August at 12 noon the people, numbering 15,000 men, would invade the city and that that was the right time for the PETA and the Pemudas to take part in the overthrowing of Japanese power. The students thought that the PETA was ready across the whole of Java to carry out this coup and that the Pemudas of all Java would rally behind the API. But the position was in fact different. At the appointed time nothing happened in Djakarta. And no more did anything happen outside it. There were no 15,000 men marching on the city. There was no PETA springing into action. Pemuda movements in other places knew nothing of what the API had planned. The disappointed students then turned their backs on Sukarni and his mob. On the setting up of the National Committee on the 19th of August their chairman, Dr. Tadjaluddin, officially declared that they stood behind Sukarno and Hatta.

Far from a victory for the Pemudas, the abduction of Sukarno and Hatta to Rengasdengklok and their return to Djakarta on the same day is historic proof of the bankruptcy of a policy that was pursued without calculation and which was based entirely on sentiment. It also shows their political impotence! Because of this abduction the proclamation, which was originally fixed for the 16th of August, had to be postponed for a day.

With this analysis we do not in any sense seek to diminish the merits of the Pemudas in the Indonesian struggle for freedom. They contributed a great deal to the result. And the merits of those whose actions I cannot always underwrite, and who are sometimes in opposition to our standpoint, I can also value. But their attitude, stubborn and suspicious of other points of view, hindered the course of the struggle a great deal. If, however, they had not been so full of fight at the beginning of our national revolution, then it would

certainly have been difficult to awaken a people's struggle of such strength that people were prepared to suffer for it for years.

The activity of the Pemuda in taking action and in forming the driving force stimulated the leaders to feel responsible and to hold back when they realised that they were not up to their task. It must be denied that the Pemudas and the people, together with the apparatus of state of the Indonesian Republic, formed the engine for our national revolution. The suggestion that the Pemudas were the only torch-bearers of the revolution is, however, false. There are Pemuda groups which wanted to take the leadership of the revolution into their own hands from the very beginning. Now that they have not succeeded in this they must not place the blame on others. They must find the explanation within themselves and in the law of history, which on the basis of reality places every group somewhere befitting its powers and according to its mentality.

One cannot demand the leadership of a revolution. This must be secured on the basis of the trust of the people in their leaders. The people can choose wrongly, but as long as it trusts its leaders it will respect the revolution. Only the trust of the people in victory will make the revolution triumph.

First published in *Mimbar Indonesia*, no. 32/33, 17th August 1951.

1. By Regasdengklok barracks the author means the PETA barracks. No Japanese troops were stationed there.
2. The house meant by the author was the residence of vice-admiral Maeda and was borrowed for the purpose of the meeting of that night because the Hotel des Indes, the place where the meeting was originally to be held, was already closed. This must be mentioned because those who bear a grudge against independent Indonesia have spread the false information that the meeting of that night was sponsored by the Japanese.
3. Dimyati wrote that his dissertation on the proclamation struggle was borrowed from the book *Riwajat Proklamasi 17 Augustus 1945*, a product of the pen of Adam Malik. The attentive reader will have noticed that Muhammad Dimyati has only written a *story* in his book, not *history*.
4. An example of its way of browbeating and intimidating is mentioned here. In the evening of the 15th of August, when I was busy drafting the text of the proclamation, on which a decision would be reached the following day at the meeting of the Preparation Committee, Mr. Subardjo came and asked me to go with him to Bung Karno because he was being surrounded by some Pemudas under the leadership of Wikana and Chairul Saleh.
   When I arrived there I saw that Wikana was trying to persuade Bung Karno to declare that very evening over the radio that Indonesia had freed itself

from the Japanese grip. Because Bung Karno stood firm and refused to do it, because he could not justify this act, Wikana threatened with these words: 'If Bung Karno won't broadcast this message this evening, tomorrow there will be killing and bloodshed on a large scale'. When he heard this threat Bung Karno's blood rose to his head. He advanced on Wikana and said: 'Here is my neck. Drag me to that corner and take my life this evening. You don't have to wait until tomorrow'. Wikana seemed shocked at Bung Karno's reaction, which hc had not expected, and he then said: 'We don't want to murder you. We only want to remind you that if Indonesia is not declared independent this evening tomorrow the people will take action and will kill those people it distrusts and whom it regards as followers of the Dutch, like the Ambonese, for example'. Browbeating, nothing but browbeating, which that evening however missed its mark, because the principles clash with each other.

43 Message to the All-Indonesian Christian Youth Association

While tonight I am giving this message to the All-Indonesian Christian Youth Association, my heart is full to overflowing with the atmosphere of the Aid el Fitr Festival which will be celebrated tomorrow throughout the entire Muslim world. This festival of Islam is, indeed, a Day of Brotherhood, a day when we are expected to forgive one another for our sins and failures of the year which has passed. It is a holy day, a day when the soul must be pure and unsullied. It is a moment in time which is perfused with an atmosphere of peace, a moment when man can forget the struggles of life, when he can disregard the tangle of our society. He can divorce his mind from the threats of war which means the entire world – for to give birth to discordant thoughts on this Day is a sin.

With these thoughts in my mind I am now addressing myself to a young people's congress, the All-Indonesia Christian Youth Association. Whenever I am called upon to address young people, I am ever mindful of the fact that 'Youth is the flowering of the Nation' – or indeed, 'Youth is the Nation's Hope'. For the young people of my land, now gathered in Congress, I hope and pray that these will not be empty, flattering words, but words which will become a reality.

The youth of today are the citizens of the future. Yours will be the task of ensuring the prosperity of our country in the future. It will be your job to take over from the present leaders of our country and of our society. The life span of an individual man is finite, but the life of a nation is eternal. It is for this reason that we must face up to and solve the problem of replacing the nation's leaders. Whether the future of Indonesia will be great and noble or miserable and poor rests entirely on the shoulders of the youth of today. The future security of our Nation depends upon your sense of responsibility, the seriousness of your attitudes, your good conscience and your willingness to serve.

I have always said that ours is a fourfold aim: Freedom, a Sovereign Indonesia, Law and Order, and Prosperity.

We have now succeeded in achieving a Free and Sovereign Indonesia. Much of this is the result of the efforts, struggles and sacrifices of our forebears in the past. In the achievement of this great ideal of a Free Indonesia many of them died on the gallows, were killed in battle or suffered the misery of imprisonment. But despite their deprivations and hardships they remained ever faithful to the native land in its time of sorrow. Many of the writers and patriots who died in this way never lived to see the birth of Free Indonesia. Their lives were doomed to be restricted to sacrifice after sacrifice and misery after misery, but nonetheless accompanied by the inner glow of happiness at the thought that in the end their ideal would win through, in the end their sacrifice would indeed bring about the creation of Free Indonesia, the ultimate ideal of the Nation.

We who are privileged to live in the present age are now reaping the harvest made possible by our fellow-men and patriots who went before. Now we have a free and sovereign Indonesia.

But the job is still not yet finished. It is up to us who are here now to build a law-abiding and stable Indonesia, an Indonesia which is prosperous.

The tasks which face us are not easy ones. They cannot be accomplished by merely mouthing violent slogans. They can only be accomplished by serious and sustained effort.

I must tell you that it will not be easy to succeed in creating a stable and prosperous Indonesia, even though we have now attained our free and sovereign Indonesia. For the free and sovereign Indonesia we have received is incomplete and is suffering from the ravages of the struggle for independence. It will only be by concerted efforts that we can overcome these enormous difficulties. We must have a burning faith in our ability to succeed in the achievement of our ideals.

The Youth of today, which will become the Nation of tomorrow, since they are students must have a deep understanding of the tasks which face them. It is in the hands of our present youth, who will replace their fathers – and their mothers – as the leaders of our land and its people, that there rests the future of our nation. For this reason the Youth of Indonesia must not keep separate from one another because of differences in religion. Instead they must seek unity and consolidation. I urge you to imprint in your minds our national motto: Unity in Diversity.

I would like at this point to call to mind a poem written by Schiller, which I will translate into English:

'Our aim is to become a united nation
One which will not be divided in time of danger or trouble
Our aim is to be a free nation, like our forefathers.
Rather choosing death than life as slaves
We believe in God the Almighty
So how can we fear the power of man!

My children, you have an even louder clarion call than Schiller's, a call which can be your guide throughout life. This is the Fifth Principle of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

This Fifth Principle is at the very root of our constitution, because it has not only the power of law but also an underlying moral power. The whole of our basic constitution is in fact the outworking of the Fifth Principle, the foundation of all its moral truth.

What is the meaning of the Fifth Principle?

If we are to understand this, we must first of all study the contents of the fourth paragraph of the Preamble to the Fundamental Constitution, which embodies the basic philosophy on which our State is founded. This states as follows:
'For this reason we must build up our independence in the form of a Charter of State, so that it has the form of a United Republic, based on the acknowledgment of our belief in one God, in the dignity of man, in nationhood, in democracy and social justice, thus providing the basis for the creation of happiness, prosperity, peace and freedom in our society and a stable state of Free Indonesia enjoying complete sovereignty and upholding the rule of law'.

It can clearly be seen from this paragraph that the 'State of Indonesia' which takes the form of a United Republic, is based on the acknowledgment of the following five principles:

1. Belief in One God
2. Humanity
3. Nationalism
4. Democracy
5. Social righteousness

The Fifth Principle sets out as an obligation of our State – which means an obligation resting upon all of us, both senior citizens and

youth, the creation of a Free Indonesia with complete sovereignty, based on four qualities for the people:

1. Happiness
2. Prosperity
3. Peace
4. Freedom

This, then, is our way of life! The achievement of these four basic qualities is a moral and political obligation resting upon us all.

I would like to reiterate the moral and political obligation which rests on us all as a result of this Fifth Principle. If the Fifth Principle is not to be mere empty words but a true and deep conviction, we cannot avoid the responsibility which falls upon us. If we look at this Fifth Principle, we shall find that in fact it has two foundations, namely a moral foundation and a political foundation.

The moral foundation is the acknowledgment of our belief in One God.

By acknowledging this fact, we cannot treat the matter as trivial. We are dealing with the affairs of the eternal soul and the conduct of man. The true value of the character of man finds its expression in the honesty of his purpose.

In actual fact there are several religions which are followed in Indonesia, namely Islam, Christianity (both Protestantism and Catholicism), Shiva etc. The followers of each of these religions can perform their belief in one God, according to their own convictions.

In Chapter 43 of our Basic Constitution we guarantee the freedom for every citizen to follow his own religion and carry on his acts of worship in accordance with his conscience and belief.

However, despite the fact that the forms of worship of the various religions differ, their aim is the same: that of striving towards truth, justice, goodness and honesty, and in the name of God, the safety of the state and people of Indonesia. On this solid foundation it is possible for us to build up a powerful cooperation between all the different social groups of our country who acknowledge their belief in One God.

The other four precepts form the political basis of our State: humanity, nationhood, democracy and social justice. All these precepts had their being in the days of the past struggles of our independence movement, so that it is only logical that they should find their place in Indonesia in the days of her newly-won sovereignty.

If we look carefully at the structure of our Constitution, we can

see that the basic level is occupied by the moral foundations. In this way our State and its Government obtain a stable foundation, and one which is based on truth, justice, goodness and honesty as well as the brotherhood of man, both in respect of our own citizens and in respect of foreign countries. By establishing its political activities on this sound basis, the Government will succeed in achieving its high aim of 'social justice for every Indonesian'.

Perhaps it will help understanding these points if I summarise them once again:

The basic principle of a belief in one God is a principle which leads us to the ideal of political activity when we are trying to perform all things which are good. The basic principle of humanity is a practical expression of this basic theoretical principle.

If we take these fundamental principles as our guide, the rulers of our State will never swing away from the straight line which will ensure the safety of our society, which will strive for all things that are good in the world and for the establishment of brotherhood between nations. If at any moment we find we have slipped away to one side, these basic guidelines will lead us back on to the right track.

The fundamental principle of belief in the one God is not merely a principle of belief but it is a guideline which leads us to truth, justice, goodness and honesty. Our State, with a constitution constructed in this way, is built on a strong and stable foundation, and in this way we can achieve the unity of our nation without splitting it up into its diverse parts, ensuring a government which guarantees political and economic democracy so that the people are assured of a proper livelihood and a state of social justice.

My children now meeting in Congress. If you are able fully to understand the basic principles of our Constitution, which is the very ideology of our State, I need have no fear for the future and I will know that the future of Indonesia will be steered by the right men.

But a mere conviction is not enough. It is also necessary for you all to obtain the knowledge which is required to undertake this great task – the task of building Indonesia as a state of law and order, an Indonesia which will be prosperous and strong. Do all you can to strengthen your own character so that it can meet the challenge of our time and to enable you to serve our land according to your own particular talents.

Finally, I pray to Almighty God that the All-Indonesian Christian Youth Association Congress will meet with every success and will be able to give its support and assistance to the strengthening of the united nation of Free Indonesia in full and absolute sovereignty.

Now that we have won freedom, let us ensure that freedom remains with us!

Djakarta, 22nd June 1952.

44 The co-operative movement as an institution for teaching autoactivity and a high economic character

Opening speech delivered by Vice-President Mohammad Hatta on August 8, 1955 before the third Seminar on Co-operatives held in Bandung on the initiative of ILO/FAO.

Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to have this opportunity to address you today at the opening session of the Regional Training Course on Co-operation. And the fact that this time you have chosen Bandung as the site of your deliberations is a measure of your appreciation of the co-operative movement in Indonesia. Let us hope that this compliment which you have paid us will spur the Indonesian co-operation movement to greater efforts.

This seminar is being undertaken jointly on the initiative of the International Labour Organisation and the Food Agricultural Organisation within the sphere of the activities of the United Nations. This is a sign of increased international confidence in the co-operative movement as the best means of giving training in economic activity to peoples who are customarily termed 'under-developed'. For this reason I ask your attention for a little while to the question of the 'co-operative movement as an institution for training in auto-activity and a high economic character'.

There is nothing extraordinary about the fact that the co-operative movement is a form of joint endeavour for those with a weak economy. We also find economic co-operation in several other forms; in business firms, in limited liability companies, and in its strongest form in trusts, cartels and concerns. The difference between the co-operative movement and the other types of economic co-operation is that, while the emphasis in co-operatives is on the looking after of common needs, the nature of the other forms of economic co-operation places the emphasis on the search for profits

In such organisations all their activities are entrusted to a board of directors or the management, whereas the majority of members or shareholders merely wait for profits at the end of the year. In a limited liability company, for instance, the position of a shareholder is not very much different from that of a creditor. He participates with his capital but his link with the enterprise is not a strong one and can easily be speedily snapped. If he should sell his shares, his connection with the business is ended. A limited liability company, although it represents a form of economic co-operation, is actually a form of speculation for those who have capital and want the biggest return from it. A limited liability company is by its nature an association of capital and not an association of individuals. And because of this a limited liability company is an organisation which specifically supports capitalism. Capitalism advances and grows big under the form which Liefmann terms *Effektenkapitalismus.*

As distinct from the loose co-operation we see in trade organisations, we find close co-operation in co-operative societies. In a co-operative society each of its members participates by contributing his services. Profits earned are not primarily distributed in accordance with the amount of capital invested, but in proportion to the services rendered to the co-operative society. Indeed, co-operative society is a voluntary association which men are free to join and to resign from at will. But membership carries with it certain idealistic and material conditions. A member is free to resign at any moment, yet his connection with his co-operative society is not immediately ended. For a period of time after his resignation, say for the duration of a year, his responsibilities remain and his capital investment in the co-operative also remains there. Seeing that a co-operative society as essentially co-operation among people with the same objective of satisfying common needs, any co-operative society is, to a greater or lesser extent, bound to a certain ideal. For that reason it is not every member who will lightly forsake his co-operative association. In every co-operative society is to be found a spiritual bond among its members. For that reason it can be said that a social basis is to be found in the co-operative movement. And it is upon this social base that economic co-operation is founded.

While trade associations such as business firms, limited liability companies and so forth are purely economic structures, the co-operative society is structurally sociologic and economic. By this I do not mean to imply that firms, limited liability companies,

trusts, cartels and concerns do not possess sociological significance. The development of these economic organisations has had a big influence on the development of the society, and has consequently given rise of various sociological problems. But in contrast with co-operative societies, these other structures are purely economic in nature. These economic structures, by their actions and their rational economic objectives based on the profit motive, bring into being various sociological problems in the community. Big enterprises employing tens of thousands of employees have, in fact, become a society in their own right. But because economic and juridical control over these undertakings is not in the hands of those who work together inside them in accordance with the system of a proper division of the work to be done, the position of these big enterprises has become a topical problem in this century of ours. These enterprises have expanded into social entities that have not at all as yet conformed to the requirements of a society. On account of this, intervention of the government, as the watchdog of the masses, will continue to increase in these private associations which, basically, are associations of capital. Their actions outside their confines have to be supervised. The rights and welfare of the workers in these enterprises and of their families should be regulated by laws based upon social justice. And the development of these huge enterprises are to a large extent still subject to a conflict of needs and interests between labour and capital and, because of that, carries with it an overt or covert class struggle.

In the co-operative movement there is basically no class struggle, for co-operatives are a form of co-operation among people with similar interests and objectives. The co-operative movement is not guided by what is called in German *Erwerbsprinzip*, but by *Bedarfdeckungsprinzip*, not by the profit motive but by the desire to satisfy common needs. Admittedly, profits are earned in the running of a co-operative, but such profits as accrue were not the motivating force but a by-product of the work done. The earning of profits is good because thereby occasional risks can be done away with. However, it does not matter if no profits are obtained as that was never the principal objective, the real objective being – and I repeat – provisions for common needs and common interests.

I said just now that basically there is no class struggle in the co-operative movement. A co-operative society that really lives up to its name is basically a form of voluntary co-operation among those who have the desire to look after common needs and common

interests. The question of labour and capital does not arise. All the members of a co-operative are at the same time employer and employee guided by the same ideals. Also, when an industrial enterprise is run on co-operative principles, the class struggle is foreign to it. Among its members are to be found labourers, foremen, supervisors and those who have the inherent capacity to be leaders. Wages are decided in line with the importance of the job and the amount of responsibility borne by an individual in the running of the enterprise. Individuals execute their work in harmony with the working hours and discipline demanded by the economics of the enterprise. Nevertheless, after working hours and in matters such as dividing the profits and determining the policy of the undertaking, all of them enjoy the same rights. All decisions are arrived at through consultation on the basis of one man one vote. As defined by Taussig:[1] 'Workmen get together, and procure in some way (by saving, borrowing, public aid) an initial capital. They possess their own tools and plant, buy their materials, sell the output, and divide among themselves the proceeds. They are their own managers and their own employers; and if successful they can secure business profits as well as ordinary wages, and, not least, can emancipate themselves from the dependent position of the hired employee'.

This is the most accurate definition of the co-operative movement. But in practice, based upon the existing co-operative laws, we find a kind of co-operative movement which deviates from that genuine pattern. The outward structure resembles the usual co-operative society, but the situation within is exactly like a normal capitalistic enterprise in which one finds that, by and large, the relationship between labour and capital is subject to a conflict of interests. In Indonesia, such a type of imperfect co-operative is found, for example, in the textile sector of industries and in fishermen's co-operatives. The main work is done by labourers and fishermen who receive wages, while those who are banded together in the co-operative are their employers who own the business and possess ships. A union of this sort is not a co-operative but a *concentration.*

In a genuine co-operative there is no conflict of interests; on the contrary, a similarity of interests which is achieved by working together. Those who do the main work – such as spin yarn and weave, as is the case with fishermen who navigate ships and do fishing – should become members of the co-operative. The leading of the Co-operative Department in the Ministry of Economic Af-

fairs is working extremely hard to bring that ideal to pass. The owners of such co-operative societies have shown good will, but the difficulty is that those who work for them prefer to remain labourers earning passable wages rather than assume the responsibilities, such as conferring with each other and attending meetings, thrust upon them by membership in co-operative. They have not realised the benefits that go with those responsibilities. Additionally, membership carries with it the facing of business risks.

All this goes to show that it is not so easy to start and run a co-operative society. It is far easier to participate in a limited liability company because the majority of its members remain, whereas the leadership and management of the industry are handed over to a handful of people. The majority of members are merely interested in the division of profits at the end of the year. It is more difficult to set up and manage a co-operative because all its members must participate actively, and with an awareness of their obligations, in order to make the undertaking prosper. Members of co-operative should be filled with the idealism needed to look after common interests, they should have self-respect, and they should have faith in their joint ability to protect their common interests. They should have the confidence that participation in the co-operative movement will help them to raise their level as human beings.

For this reason the co-operative movement calls for education and training which not only cannot be acquired in a short while but must needs consume decades. First of all there must be the co-operative ideals, and these must continually be kept alive in the hearts of the people. It is only after that that it will be possible to start co-operatives to translate those ideals into practice. And when the movement runs well it, in turn, strengthens the co-operative ideals.

Indeed there is so much truth in what Gromoslav Mladenatz[2] says:

'Au sein du mouvement coopératif – mouvement de réalisations pratiques, ayant toutefois un but plus éloigné qu'il cherche à atteindre par un mouvement graduel et pacifique, – l'idéologue et le réalisateur se trouvent très souvent réunies dans la même personne. En tout cas, ils restent dans une entente parfaite et en collaboration permanente. En un pareil mouvement il ne peut pas exister de contradiction ou même de malentendu permanent entre la *théorie* et la pratique.

Dans l'histoire coopérative l'idée précède parfois la réalisation

et parfois la suite. Elle est alors la synthèse de certaines expériences qui domine les actes.
dont le détail peut différer, mais dont la complexité dégage *l'unité*

L'idée et la réalisation restent dans le mouvement coopératif en un échange permanent d'influences et de suggestions.

En tant qu'action pratique, le mouvement coopératif ne peut pas se priver *d'idée*, de *doctrine*, ce qui fait qu'il est une *action consciente*, ayant des buts bien déterminés et dont la *politique* est tracée de manière précise. La doctrine est donc nécessaire à notre mouvement pour lui conserver son caractère spécifique, l'empêcher de dévier de son but, comme de devenir l'annexe d'autres actions sociales et de tâtonner dans l'inconnu. La doctrine est pour le coopérateur le phare qui éclaire la route.'

That is the view held by Gromoslav Mladenatz and, generally speaking, it is the same as mine. I have cited Mladenatz at some length because there is to be found in his compact account an extremely clear picture of the relationship between theory and practice in the co-operative movement. Practice is made possible by theory, and theory itself is apparent because of practice. The co-operative movement needs to be guided by ideals, and the ideals of the movement reach perfection because of the results yielded by the co-operative movement in facing the reality which can possibly be achieved step by step in society. The ideals of the co-operative movement are grounded upon the confidence that the movement translates into practice that joint endeavour which is of great benefit in the achievement of the common objective, whether for a group or for the individual. Very true indeed is what Bernard Lavergne[3] says:

'Dans sa *politique* Spinoza observe que les passions humaines demeurent inévitablement les mêmes d'age en age, mais que le génie des institutions favorables consiste à savoir concilier l'intérêt général avec les passions égoistes et mauvaises des hommes. Très heureusement le génie de l'idée coopérative donne la clé du problème jusqu'ici vainement cherchée de tous côtés *l'idée coopérative réussit à faire coincider l'intérêt privé de chacun avec l'intérêt de tous.*'
the co-operative movement it is possible to achieve a higher living

The value of co-operatives lies in their ability to reconcile individual with common interests. The astonishing thing is that through standard built upon simple bases. The co-operative movement does not seek to lay down the principle of creating an elite class. That would be difficult to attain. It proceeds to build through ordinary

people who have some idealism in them. Their strength lies in their unity and identity of views in the pursuit of common interests. They do not chase an ideal high up in the clouds. The ideals they seek, such as the common welfare, are situated in the realm of the possible. Lavergne is not wrong when he portrays the surprise caused by the co-operative movement as 'the creation of an altruistic and just order on human greed'. That statement possibly represents a paradox. But its secret is that co-operatives can channel individual objectives in the direction of protecting common interests. Inside that association a person, the individual referred to, feels himself become strong, loses his feeling of inferiority, and faith in joint ability is made increasingly firm. From an egoistic individual he is transformed into a social being conscious of his worth. An individual does not lose his identity by joining a co-operative, nor does he become an inanimate member submerged in a collective. Through the co-operative movement he is made conscious of his worth and becomes aware of his reponsibility for the good and welfare of the entire community.

On this account I am confident that co-operatives are the one and only means of raising the economic standard of the peoples of Asia just freed from foreign domination and whose countries are popularly referred to as 'under-developed'.

When we study the literature on 'under-developed countries' – each year sees an increasing number of books on this subject written by western experts – there is the general opinion that the low productivity of the individual is responsible for these countries being backward. For that reason, consumption is also very small, so that it is hard to say that there is any prosperity. The cause of all this is lack of capital, inadequate technical knowledge and a want of 'managerial skill'.

All that is true. But when means are sought to help these backward countries, an inordinate amount of weight is placed on economic rationalism. People are apt to forget the psychological factors which have a tremendous influence on this matter. The emphasis is on capital aid and technical skill.

This view is influenced by one fact in the world of today, namely, that the influence of capital and technical skill on production has resulted in rich countries becoming richer and poor countries becoming poorer. Consequently, global economy is becoming progressively lop-sided and unstable. This condition will eventually prove detrimental to the development of the industrialised nations

who desire expanded markets and prosperous world community.

Generally speaking two methods are advocated for the development of the economy of the under-developed peoples. The *first* method is based upon old classical economic teachings. Capital investment in under-developed countries in order to advance their economy can only be justified when the transfer of investments there does not lessen the creation of international income. Beside assisting in the creation of prosperity in the backward countries, those investments should also produce a good return for foreign capital. The best investing of capital should be carried out on the lines of 'free enterprise'. On the other hand it is recognised that the system of giving aid in accordance with the teachings of classical economy will result in failure because of the attitude of the governments of the states concerned which are jealous of their newly won sovereignty and extremely suspicious of foreign capital.

The *second* method is to give capital aid as a gift, directly from the government of an advanced state to the government of the under-developed countries. With such capital and technical assistance which need not be repaid, the government of the country receiving aid can pay for the plans it has for reconstruction. At a passing glance such aid would appear to be completely altruistic in nature, because the capital that is given as a gift is obtained from taxes collected from the nationals of the donor country. It is taken from their capital savings which can actually be utilised by them to increase productivity in their own country and thereby enhance the earnings of their nationals. However, when scrutinised carefully, that assistance causes on the long run no loss but in fact brings gain. With the aid of that capital it will be possible to undertake various reconstruction projects, the prosperity of the inhabitants of the receiving country becomes increased, and its buying power is enhanced. The economic progress achieved by this hitherto backward country will eventually be of benefit to global economy. The previous gap between rich and poor countries will be narrowed, and international exchange can be restarted smoothly with consequent benefits to both sides. Finally, the gains obtained from the developing prosperity will also appertain to the nationals of the country that made a gift of capital aid.

Indeed, there is a sane economic base to the idea of giving capital aid and 'technical skill' as a gift to under-developed countries. However, as I pointed out before, this is a lop-sided view. This viewpoint places too much stress on economic values which,

by themselves, are quite valid but it overlooks psychological factors that can give effect to those economic factors.

For the purpose of developing the economy of what is called an 'under-developed country', it is first of all necessary to awaken the productive energy of the population that has hitherto lived under the pressure of an inferiority complex. That can only be realised by the co-operative movement which, as I had occasion to point out, can achieve a higher living standard through utilisation of persons of medium capabilities. It is of course true that large projects, such as the construction of dams and irrigation works and the generation of electricity and the like, must be undertaken by the government through use of money partly obtained from abroad in the form of loans or acquisition. But the building up of small and medium economic projects should be undertaken by the population. And because the strength of a people economically weak can only be brought about through the co-operative movement, co-operatives are a conditio sine qua non as a base for the people's economy.

With the utmost awareness we should make the co-operative movement one element in the education of the population. It is a good element for strengthening *economy* and *morality*. The co-operative movement can teach economic and moral awareness because it is based on two principles which mutually strengthen each other. These two principles are *solidarity* and *individuality,* i.e. an appreciation of one's own worth.

The co-operative movement is based on those two principles, but these two principles are, in turn, rendered strong by being fertilized by the comradeship ever present in the co-operative movement. It is only in co-operatives that solidarity and individuality can come to flower in conditions of harmonious relationship. By continually keeping alive and fertilizing this solidarity and individuality, the co-operative movement instils in the human breast a feeling of *social responsibility.*

Solidarity has always existed in the true Asian societies. In Indonesia, for example, the outward sign of this solidarity is the spirit of mutual help, the gotong rojong. In the real villages of Indonesia all the hard work that cannot be carried out by the single individual is performed jointly. Not only is work which affects the common good performed on a mutual-help basis, but even matters of private concern fall into this category. This mutual help is found, for example, in the work of building homes, farming, funeral ceremo-

nies and the like. But solidarity alone can only preserve the bond of association in a static and unchanging society. Solidarity alone cannot prod people into progress. Solidarity alone can preserve social co-operation in such matters as mutual help in the building of homes, but it cannot bring to life economic co-operation for prosperity and for raising the living standard. Economic co-operation calls for individuality as well as solidarity.

Individuality does not come into existence by itself, but has to be made to live in the human soul by means of education and careful nursing. Such nurturing and education, a matter of daily practice in business undertakings, cannot be completed in a short time. On the contrary, it is a long-term process. I should emphasize here that individuality should not be confused with individualism. Individualism is an understanding or a philosophy of living, a 'Weltanschauung', which places the individual before society as we find in the economic teachings of *Adam Smith*. Individuality is the nature of an individual who is conscious of self-respect and has faith in himself. Belief in self produces confidence and a feeling of having the capability to better one's lot through one's own efforts.

In a co-operative are blended solidarity and individuality, two elements which interact on each other, keep each other alive and put each other on the alert so that they do not slip out. The co-operative movement educates the individual to give priority to common interests when he is in pursuit of his own interest, it trains the individual to work for common needs without pressing the individual into becoming purely the instrument of the collectivity. Not only does the co-operative movement *not* give precedence to individual interests, but it does not chase after the interests of a particular group as is the case with combined organisations such as trusts, cartels and concerns. Although it takes the form of a particular grouping, the members of a co-operative society give priority to common interests even while looking after their own interests.

For example, a consumers' Co-operative which owns a shop not only sells to its own members but also to non-members. The main share of the profits, over and above a small portion distributed among members in ratio to their capital investment, is divided among all those who rendered service to the co-operative in proportion to their purchases.

Besides this, a set portion of the profits is kept apart for the education and instruction of the public. Examples are help given in the construction of a school in the area where the co-operative society is

located, assist in the building of a hospital and so on. Every co-operation movement, whatever its type, always renders social service to society.

Among the facets of *moral education* which a co-operative gives its members the following can be cited:

1. The co-operative movement teaches its members to have high ideals grounded on a base of reality. By holding out the ideals of welfare and the common good, it gathers people to carry out the work it has planned and apportioned.
2. The co-operative movement instils feelings of democracy on a practical basis calling for personal action whereby matters affecting the running and control of the enterprise are undertaken through agreement arrived at by discussion.
3. The leading members of a co-operative society are not paid wages but where necessary are given a small honorarium. By this means the base is laid for social education to do away with egoism and bring into being the ideal man who is so badly needed to give leadership to society.
4. All transactions in a co-operative society are on a cash basis. Because of this its members are gradually trained to live within their capacity and means. If anyone desires something costly, he will have to save first until he has the purchase price at his command. Thereby people are saved from the temptation of hire purchases which often causes people to be plunged in debt for life; sometimes they are forced into the calamity of selling their crops in advance.
5. All weights and measures in a co-operative store must be true. Its members are trained to be neither negligent nor dishonest, thereby teaching them to be honest.
6. The co-operative movement spurs its members on to saving money at all times and sometimes to safeguard their livelihood and the safety of their enterprise at a future time.

These are the various kinds of co-operative education found in practice so that people can be trained to be morally strong and pure. The co-operative movement trains the social man with a social responsibility to society. Therefore, the co-operative movement which puts the accent on joint welfare gives the incentive towards the realisation of social justice.

The ideals of the co-operative movement can survive only with training and education calling for patience. The co-operative ideals

instilled in the heart should always shine forth as a torch to lead the way and gradually narrow the gap between the realities of life and the ideals we yearn for. In order to bring into life and spread out the co-operative movement as the basis of economy, we should be convinced that that objective can be secured.

Let us hope that the Seminar on Co-operatives to be opened now will strengthen your conviction that the co-operative movement is the only way to achieve prosperity for our peoples who are still economically weak. I trust that this incomplete treatise of mine will help to emphasize that the co-operative movement is the one proper institution for training in auto-activity and a high economic character.

I thank you.

First published as a brochure by the Ministry of Education.

1. E. W. Taussig, *Principles of economics*, Vol II, 4th ed., 1947, p. 411.
2. Gromoslav Mladenatz, *Histoire des Doctrines Cooperatives*, 1933, p. 3.
3. Bernard Lavergne, *La Révolution Coopérative*, p. 368.

45 Indonesia's foreign policy

The Republic of Indonesia, born immediately after World War II when a colony became a free country, strongly desires peace. Only in a peaceful atmosphere can it rehabilitate its war-damaged economy and lift its citizens out of the poverty in which they have lived so long. Even when Indonesians were struggling to free themselves from the control of the Netherlands, freedom was not their only objective. Leaders of the national movement always insisted that an independent and sovereign Indonesia was simply a prerequisite to the achievement of a pattern of living that would guarantee the prosperity of the people. Their slogan was 'A sovereign, independent, just and prosperous Indonesia'. Now that the country has sovereign and independent status, its citizens – of whom there are more than 75,000,000 – demand that their government carry out the twin ideals of social justice and prosperity.

The Republic of Indonesia realizes that cooperation with other countries is essential if these ideals are to become reality. It has made the United Nations the focal point of its over-all policy of seeking good relations with all other nations. More specifically, its objectives in foreign policy are: 1. to defend the freedom of the people and guard the safety of the state; 2. to obtain from overseas those articles of daily necessity required for increasing the standard of living of the population – food, especially rice, consumer goods of various kinds, medicines, and so on; 3. to obtain capital equipment to rebuild what had been destroyed or damaged, and capital for industrialization, new construction and the partial mechanization of agriculture; 4. to strengthen principles of international law and to aid in achieving social justice on an international scale, in line with the U.N. Charter, with special reference to Articles 1, 2 and 55, in particular by endeavouring within the U.N. frame work to help people still living within the colonial system to achieve freedom; 5. to place special emphasis on initiating good relations

with neighboring countries, the majority of which have in the past occupied a position similar to Indonesia; and 6. to seek fraternity among nations through the realization of the ideas enshrined in the *Panchasila* (Five Postulates) which constitute the basic Indonesian philosophy. In short, Indonesia will pursue a policy of peace and of friendship with all nations on a basis of mutual respect and noninterference with each other's structure of government.

As a people just become free from colonialism, Indonesians are jealous of their country's independence. Slogans such as 'liberty', 'humanity', 'social justice', 'the brotherhood of nations' and lasting peace', which were a sustaining force in the Indonesian national movement, are looked upon as ideals to be translated into practice. The Indonesian people, therefore, place a high value on international intercourse and are confident that what they long for in this respect will eventually become a reality. All these feelings help determine the country's foreign policy and the means employed to carry it out.

It is possible that, viewed from the angle of *Real-politik*, some of these aims seem to lie outside the realm of 'real and practical policy'. The student of history, however, is conscious that much which was previously considered utopian or impossible has come to pass. Who could have believed 15 years ago that India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan and Indonesia would become independent and sovereign? Who would then have thought it possible that Indonesia assisted by the Netherlands itself, would be accepted as a member of an international organization such as the United Nations? Many ideas tabu to classical economists and put down as pure Socialist dreams have today become accepted in capitalist countries as a means of achieving 'industrial peace'. The development and acceptance of what is called 'social security' is an instance. The influence of such ideas is to be found in the Charter of the United Nations and in the work of the I.L.O. The goals of 'higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development' are set down in article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations. Most of the nations of the world assume today that the attainment of these ideals should be stimulated by government and not handed over, as previously, to the 'free play of economic forces'.

The objectives which the Republic of Indonesia seeks to achieve through its foreign policy should therefore not be considered merely utopian. But while some are of topical importance, others

are ideals for future realization. For this reason the foreign policy of the Republic has short-term and long-term aspects. The short-term policy relates to matters which must be translated into practice now or in the near future – those affecting Indonesia's particular interests or those connected with international tensions capable of affecting the peace of the world. But long-term objectives, which require a change in the spirit of international thinking and morality, must also be emphasized in order that they will receive attention. Thus the long-term policy is intimately bound up with the short-term policy.

Talk of brotherhood of man in a world in which racial discrimanation makes possible the existence of such a policy as 'apartheid', or talk of everlasting peace in the atmosphere of the cold war, indeed seems incongruous. Be that as it may, the Republic of Indonesia feels it its duty to strengthen the ideals of peace, however weak its voice or feeble its power. It believes that these ideals will become reality in the long run. It believes in the common sense of mankind. The peoples' desire for peace, as opposed to their lust for war, becomes stronger from century to century. Evil often prevails over the forces for good and destroys what civilization has built up over the ages. But man, rational by nature, will eventually make a positive and definite choice of good over evil, peace over war. The discovery of weapons of war which become progressively more terrifying and destructive will strengthen men's love of peace and arouse hatred of war. It is this conviction that leads the Republic of Indonesia to believe that the struggle for world peace is today a policy based on reality.

This explains why the Republic of Indonesia has not aligned itself with either the American bloc or the Russian bloc in the existing conflict, and why it is not prepared to participate in any third bloc designed to act as a counterpoise to the two giant blocs. To do that would merely create new suspicions and new enmities. And though Indonesia's policy has often been termed one of neutrality, it is not that either. 'Neutrality' has a precise meaning in international law, defining a condition of imperiality toward belligerent states. Writing in the *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Philip C. Jessup states that 'the modern legal status of neutrality implies the impartiality of one state towards two or more belligerent states'. And he says truly that 'it may well be argued that in the present or future conditions of world solidarity, neutrality is an

antisocial status'. As a member of the United Nations, the Republic of Indonesia cannot adopt an attitude of neutrality. It is committed to international solidarity. Articles 41 and 43 of the U. N. Charter do not give any option to the course of action open to a member when the Security Council has declared the behaviour of another state to be unlawful.

But in practice, of course, international solidarity has not been achieved; world solidarity has cracked into two pieces. Under present conditions it would not be possible for Indonesia to be other than neutral if a war broke out. The existence of war is a special case in the life of nations.

Unfortunately, Indonesia has to face a situation entirely different from the one forecast during the years of World War II. The world envisaged then is reflected in the ideology of the Charter, but the postwar world is characterised by the conflict between the American and the Soviet blocs. The opposition between the two, due to different economic systems, has been heightened by a conflict of idealogies in every particular. The cold war is an ideological war – the 'free world' versus 'the peoples' democracies'. The Western countries with similar culture and political concepts seek safety alongside the United States, which possesses great economic and industrial power. The Communist states behind the Iron Curtain form a compact bloc stretching from Middle Europe to the Pacific Ocean and covering a large portion of Asia, with a total population of not less than 800,000,000 souls – as almost limitless reserve of manpower for their armed forces. In such a situation, international life is dominated by power politics.

Western nations tend to hold that there is no middle position for the weaker countries, and that they must choose between the one bloc or the other. It seems logical to them that nations which desire to enjoy independence should choose the free world, and they remind neutral countries of the fate of Belgium and the Netherlands in the Second World War. As already stated, however, the policy of the Republic of Indonesia is not one of neutrality, because it is not constructed in reference to belligerent states but for the purpose of strengthening and upholding peace. Indonesia plays no favorites betwee the two opposed blocs and follows its own path through the various international problems. It terms this policy 'independent', and further characterizes it by describing it as independent and 'active'. By active is meant the effort to work energetically for the preservation of peace and the relaxation of tension generat-

ed by the two blocs, through endeavours supported if possible by the majority of the members of the United Nations. As an illustration of this policy may be cited the efforts made by Indonesia, in concert with the Arab and Asian countries, to put an end to the war in Korea.

This island archipelago is in a very different kind of position from that in which the Netherlands and Belgium found themselves at the beginning of World War II. It does not share a common boundary with any of the possible belligerents. Indonesia, it may be said, is bounded by the British Navy and the American Navy, which control the Indian and Pacific Oceans. But no one can say that Britain and the United States have evil designs on Indonesia. On the contrary, they are desirous of seeing Indonesia remain independent and become prosperous. Are they not the very people who hold that the infiltration of Communism can be prevented only by raising the economic level of the masses?

Further, Indonesia does not have common frontiers with Soviet Russia or China. A direct threat from that direction to Indonesian independence neither exists nor is possible. Only the domestic Communist movement is a political factor in Indonesia, but in this regard Indonesia's position is no different from that of the other democratic countries. Consequently, there is no pressing need for her to make a choice between the two big blocs. Her independent policy keeps her from enmity with either party, preserves her from the damage to her own interests that would follow from taking sides, and permits her to be friends with all nations on a basis of mutual respect. The desire to put political relations with other nations on a footing of mutual respect, despite differences in the governmental structure and ideology, is a primary factor in this approach to international relations. Nations recently become independent are strongly influenced by national sentiment and feel the need to maintain their self-respect. The memory of the colonial status that bound them for centuries makes them resist any thing they consider an attempt to colonize them again, whether by economic or ideological domination. This psychological factor profoundly influences Indonesia in her insistence upon an independent policy.

The foundation of this policy was laid by the Indonesian Government in 1948 while it was still engaged in a struggle against the Netherlands to maintain its new independence and at the same time to free the whole of the Indonesian people from foreign rule.

(As a consequence of the first Netherlands' military action and steady whittling away of its territories, the Republic of Indonesia found itself at that time confined to extreme West and Middle Java and North and Central Sumatra.) While the leftist parties under the leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia were ranged in opposition, the Indonesian Government made the following policy statement to the Working Committee of the Provisional Parliament on September 2, 1948:

'Have the Indonesian people fighting for their freedom no other course of action open to them than to choose between being pro-Russian or pro-American? Is there no other position that can be taken in the pursuit of our national ideals? The Indonesian Government is of opinion that the position to be taken is that Indonesia should not be a *passive* party in the area of the international politics but that it should be an *active* agent entitled to decide its own standpoint . . . The policy of the Republic of Indonesia must be resolved in the light of its own interests and should be executed in consonance with the situations and facts it has to face . . . The lines of Indonesia's policy cannot be determined by the bent of the policy of some other country which has *its* own interests to service.'

Prime Minister Wilopo, who assumed office on May 22, 1952, redefined the Government's independent policy in the following significant words:

'When the Government stated that its conduct of foreign affairs would be in an 'independent' manner, the underlying idea was to make it clear that, in face of the fact that there are two opposed trends in international circles which have given rise to two blocs – the Western bloc with the United States and its allies, and the Eastern bloc with its adherents – the Republic of Indonesia has decided to adopt an independent attitude in the sense that:

a) it does not permanently take sides by pledging itself to either of the two blocs which are in controversy with each other;

b) it does not pledge itself permanently to keep aloof or to remain neutral in every incident which may arise out of controversy between the two blocs.

On the other hand, as it has subsequently turned out that the statement regarding an "independent attitude" – the nature of which is wholly negative – has given rise to misunderstanding, or at least some doubt, among political parties in our own country or between one or both of the opposed blocs, the Government has given the

additional clarification that its "independent attitude" is of a positive nature in the sense that, when a problem or incident arises due to the controversy between the two blocs – or which more or less has a bearing on such a controversy – the Republic of Indonesia will continue to base its attitude on its independence of action, taking into consideration:

a) its own conception of its aim and purpose as a sincere, loyal and serious member of the United Nations, and

b) its belief in the importance of this state and nation as a factor of great influence in the immediate as well as remote future.

In view of its purpose and aim as a member of the United Nations, our Republic will rally to or support every effort within the framework of the United Nations to do away with, or at least grind off, the sharpness of the controversy between the two trends or blocs, so as to ward off as much as possible the cropping up of a large-scale conflict that may set off a third world war.

As regards its belief in the importance of this state and nation, the Republic of Indonesia will adopt a definite standpoint and strive for a decision or settlement of every problem and incident in order to preserve, protect and, wherever possible, enhance and strengthen the interests of the state and its people in keeping with the conditions or pledges which it may have to accept when arriving at the decision or settlement indicated above.

First and foremost, we must see that the independence, sovereignty and territory of the state will not be infringed upon or threatened, and that the Republic of Indonesia does not become involved in any armed conflict except for the defense of its independence and sovereignty against a direct attack launched from without or within.'

It will be seen from the above statement that the independent policy is only one aspect of the Indonesian foreign policy, which as a whole centers around a policy of peace that will guarantee the country's freedom. As a young state not possessed of sufficient military strength to defend the multitude of islands, large and small, which compose its territory, the Republic thus seeks to safeguard its independence. Its armed forces are wholly defensive; its foreign policy aims to prevent the country from being attacked. Indonesians believe that the possibility of attack will be minimized so long as the country adheres to its independent policy and actively tries to prevent the outbreak of World War III.

Inherent in this independent policy is an endeavor to seek friend-

ship with peoples belonging to either bloc, or to none, on a basis of respect for each other's independence. In the process of strengthening such friendships, Indonesia is prepared to receive intellectual, material and moral assistance from any country whatsoever, provided there is no lessening of, or threat to, her independence and sovereignty. Indeed, we are aware that at present, when the task of national construction is just beginning to be tackled, we are receiving more from the international world than we can give to it. But the time will come when we shall make a real contribution to world progress and to the strengthening of international organizations.

Of course, foreign policy is not determined just by hopes and desires, nor by the likes and dislikes of statesmen and national leaders. Objective factors play a great part in determining its nature and keeping it on a given course despite changes in the complexion of political parties or of the group that holds power at a given moment. Postwar conditions have supplied one such set of factors for Indonesia. When the Kingdom of the Netherlands transferred sovereignty on December 27, 1949, the new régime inherited a devastated land. Furthermore, it found itself with an empty treasury; the budget for 1950 envisaged a deficit of 1.5 billion guilders, approximately 17 percent of the total – a huge sum for a poor nation that had no facilities for raising capital within the country. The Government marshalled all its energies to increase domestic production, but, as could have been guessed, the transfer of sovereignty had a strong influence on the labor movement in Indonesia, for workers had never been permitted to organize freely and had had to subsist on extremely low wages. Labour hoped that the changed political situation would bring about immediate economic benefit, and the stringent circumstances in which the whole country was placed by continuously rising prices fanned discontent. Along with claims for increased wages which were reasonable enough in the circumstances, there were demands for nationalization of industries and for a change in the management of various businesses which, labor felt, were refusing to abandon the old colonial attitude. This feeling was exploited by radical leaders bent on creating turmoil, and there were political strikes along with those prompted by understandable economic motives.

The task of creating order was a difficult one. While the Netherlands troops were still in Indonesia, there was an uprising calling itself the 'Army of the Just King' under the leadership of a man

named Westerling, an ex-captain of the Netherlands Army, who hoped to seize Bandung. This *comitadji* was supported by other former members of the Netherlands Army, and there was a mutiny in Makassar, capital city of the Celebes, led by an Indonesian captain of the Netherlands forces there,[1] evidently coordinated with Westerling's activities around Bandung. Not long after that, a unit of the Royal Netherlands East Indies Army in the island of Ambon carried out a coup d'état for the purpose of setting up a 'Republic of the South Moluccas'. All these difficulties were overcome, but at the cost of much effort.

In addition to these uprisings, there has been an insurrectionary movement termed the *Darul Islam* which has been especially active in West Java, Middle Java and South Celebes. The objective of its members is the overthrow of the Republic and the establishment of an Indonesian Islamic state according to their special conceptions. Remnants of the former 'Army of the Just King', under the leadership of a Netherlander named Van Kleef, united themselves with this movement. It has done much damage, terrorizing the people and showing no respect for human life. The Indonesian Government has been doing its best to put an end to it and successive Cabinets have given the question of security priority.

Although Indonesia had been administered as one unit up to the Japanese occupation, the rise of nationalism led the Netherlands Government to believe that cutting up the archipelago would help in perpetuating its rule. Following two military actions in 1947 and 1948, therefore, it split Indonesia into 16 separate units, linked administratively on a federal basis. The mutinies in Bandung and Makassar prompted a strong demand by the people, first in West Java and East Indonesia and then throughout the whole country, that the Indonesian Government put an end to this arrangement to divide and rule. Although a federal system is, in fact, suitable for such a far-flung archipelago as Indonesia, and might be expected to strengthen the feeling of unity, the manner and timing of the move by the Netherlands Indies Government had aroused such antipathy towards ideas of federation that it was found necessary to make the change from a federal to a unitary state before a constituent assembly could be formed to draw up a definitive constitution.

These are instances of the problems that beset the young Republic. Internal consolidation is the primary task. The Government must show evidence of economic and social betterment if it is to offset the influence of agitation by radical circles. A foreign

policy that aligned the country with either bloc of the Great Powers would render this internal task infinitely more difficult.

Influencing this decision to pursue an independent policy is, again, the historic ideal of peace and friendship with all races which is so deeply imbedded in the Indonesian people. And it is reinforced by the objective facts of Indonesia's geographical situation. Nature has ordained that Indonesia, lying between two continents – the Asian mainland and Australia – and washed by the waters of two vast oceans – the Indian and the Pacific – must maintain intercourse with lands stretching in a great circle around it. From time immemorial, it has had relationships with all of them, varied as they are. Its position at the very heart of a network of communications has for centuries made the archipelage a halting place for all races and a staging base in international travel. When one considers that the territory of Indonesia extends for more than 3,000 miles and is composed of thousands of islands large and small, the magnitude of the problem of maintaining the security of the country is apparent. So extensive an area cannot be defended purely by military strength.

For economic reasons also, Indonesia must have relationships with diverse countries. The land is rich in natural resources and raw materials, but the country has not reached the stage where it can convert its raw materials into finished industrial goods. A large portion of its economy is still dependent on export. Indonesia cannot possibly reconcile herself to being tied to the economics of a few nations, all the more so because certain articles of export such as rubber are subject to much fluctuation in price. Only by adhering to a peaceful yet independent policy can Indonesia adequately safeguard its economic interests.

Last but not least of the factors which shape the foreign policy of the Indonesian Republic is the *Panchasila*, the Five Postulates that constitute the basic national philosophy, referred to at the beginning of this article. No group that holds the reins of government in the Republic, no matter what its political affiliations, will be able to carry on the affairs of state if it does not strive to act in harmony with these principles.

This is not the place to elaborate the state philosophy of the Republic of Indonesia, but a few of its aspects must be mentioned, for our friends abroad will never really understand our policies unless they realize how important these principles are to us. The *Panchasila*,

contained in the preamble to the Constitution, carries the acknowledgment that the Indonesian Republic is based upon belief in Divine Omnipotence, humanism, nationalism, democracy and social justice. Acknowledgment of Divine Omnipotence does not mean that Indonesia is a theocratic state. It should be construed as a declaration by the Indonesian people to the effect that the majority of them believe in God, and, as a corollary, acknowledge the existence of certain basic moral values. Thereby the Indonesian nation acknowledge the existence of a Hidden Power that guides mankind in its actions toward the path of truth, justice, goodness and honesty. By making belief in Divine Omnipotence the first of the Five Postulates, the Indonesian people have placed national policy on a strong moral base.

The other Postulates – humanism, nationalism, democracy and social justice – derive from the ideals that animated the Indonesian national movement and gave content and spirit to its struggle. All who took part in that struggle pledged themselves to put these ideals into practice as soon as a free Indonesia had been achieved. The *Panchasila* was accepted 'in order to enjoy prosperity, peace and freedom in society and in the completely sovereign and constitutional State of Free Indonesia which shall be governed by justice'. The objectives were embodied in the Constitution, to give continuous guidance to the administration and be incorporated in governmental programs. The ideal of 'prosperity' cannot be realized to the full without international cooperation, but our own domestic efforts can take us towards it. Realization of the ideals of 'peace' and of a 'free Indonesia' depend partially on our relations with the outside world.

The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, devised in harmony with the ideals of the *Panchasila,* has provided that the foreign policy of the country will be worked out in a democratic manner through partnership between the executive and legislative branches of the government. Governmental action looking to treaties and agreements with foreign countries is carefully scrutinized by Parliament. Unless otherwise specified by legislation, agreements and treaties are invalid until ratified by Parliament. Similarly Indonesian participation in an existing international agreement, or abrogation of any agreement or treaty, will have to be carried out under constitutional forms. There is almost no possibility that the government could enter into a secret treaty or agreement without the awareness of Parliament. In order to strengthen the ideals of

peace and international solidarity, the Constitution provides that the 'Government shall work for the inclusion of the Republic of Indonesia in international organizations', and shall 'endeavor to solve its differences with other states in a peaceful manner, and in that connection to ask for and accept international arbitration or the jurisdiction of international courts'.

The provisions of the Constitution show clearly that the aim of Indonesian foreign policy is to strengthen the ideals of peace and international solidarity as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. The country's 'independent and active' policy is an expression of these aims. Internal consolidation is, to some extent, dependent upon the succes of this independent policy; and, conversely, Indonesia will assume international significance, morally and materially, only when internal consolidation has been achieved. The Republic of Indonesia is aware that it is too weak a state to exert an effective influence on the relationships of the two opposed blocs in international politics, but it believes in the moral strength of its policy of conciliation.

First published in *Foreign Affairs, An American Quarterly Review*, April 1953.

1. The Netherlands army of more than 100.000 men was constituted in two sections, one made up entirely of Netherlanders called the Royal East Netherlands Army, and another known as the Royal East Indies Army composed largely of Indonesians with Netherlands officers in the upper echelons. By the terms of the Round Table Agreement, Indonesians serving in the latter were permitted to opt for integration into the army of the Republic.

46 Indonesia between the power blocs

Indonesia, rich in natural resources and having 84,000,000 inhabitants, comes automatically as an important factor into the chessboard of world politics. It is not surprising, then, that the Western press has been asking questions recently about the direction of Indonesian foreign policy. Will she turn her back on the West and move closer to the Communist countries whose center of attraction is Moscow? None of the politicians, diplomats, journalists or businessmen who have occasion to visit Indonesia can keep from speculating on this subject.

Anyone who remembers my article on Indonesian foreign policy in this review in April 1953 will not lightly jump to any such conclusion. Our policy is independent and active – independent because Indonesia does not wish to align herself with either of the opposition blocs, the Western bloc or the Communist bloc;[1] active because it actively carries out a peaceful policy as a loyal member of the United Nations. In view of her origins and her aims as a member of the United Nations, the Republic of Indonesia will rally to every effort within the framework of the United Nations to do away with the controversy between the two blocs, or at least to grind off its sharpness, and in this manner to help ward off large-scale conflicts that might set off a third world war. This policy of peace took shape in the well-known Resolution passed by the Asian-African Conference at Bandung in 1955.

The Republic of Indonesia has no desire to set up a third bloc in partnership with the states of Asia and Africa. She wishes to see a meeting from time to time among the Asian and African states, like that of 1955, as a 'moral union' which can influence, in the interest of peace, those states which are banded into blocs.

By practising her independent and active policy Indonesia endeavors to seek friendship with all nations – whatever their ideology or form of government – upon a basis of mutual respect. She

is prepared to accept technical, material and moral help from any country whatsoever, provided only that the donor government does not interfere in our domestic affairs or weaken or threaten our independence and sovereignty. Her policy will not easily undergo change because it stems from certain fundamental causes. Among these are certain natural factors, such as our country's geopolitical position, its national history, and the state ideology known as *Panchasila*: Divine Omnipotence, humanism, nationalism, democracy and social justice.

During the freedom movement, Indonesian leaders asked the people to strive for the attainment of an independent, sovereign, united, just and prosperous nation. Since the struggle succeeded in the achievement of a free and sovereign Indonesia, the Government's primary task has been to make it united, just and prosperous. It will easily be understood that, in order to carry out this task, Indonesia needs peace and friendship with other nations. She is rich in natural resources, but she is still young as a nation and is handicapped in nearly everything; she must have material and intellectual help from the outside world. This is one more reason which makes it incumbent upon her to practice a policy of being a friend of all, an enemy of none. Her own ideology – the *Panchasila*, which gradually assumed shape during the struggle for freedom – and the religious feeling which is present in nearly the whole population, prepare her to cooperate with the states of the West without being reluctant to be on terms of friendship with the Communist states. She well understands the policy of coexistence and non-interference. Thus, states with a different ideology from ours can readily exist peacefully side by side with us provided one absolute condition is met – abstinence of each from interference in the internal affairs of the other.

We realize that difficulties are involved in carrying out this proviso of non-interference. A democratic country has no possibility of interfering in the internal affairs of a Communist state, since everything there is under government supervision and no freedom of expression exists. Things are different in a democratic state. For example, even if Soviet Russia makes an agreement of coexistence and non-intervention and undertakes not to intervene in another country's internal affairs, the Communist Party there will nevertheless follow a policy in accordance with the directives emanating from Moscow. This is a risk which a democratic state which holds to the three freedoms of expression, movement and as-

sembly must be prepared to accept. A democratic state should have sufficient confidence in the strength of its citizen's spirit of freedom and sense of responsibility. When a democratic state is able to provide a prosperous life for its citizens, the influence of Communism will not be great. Conditions and experience in the Western world prove this truth.

In his treatise on 'Historical Materialism' Marx propounded as the very kernel of his theory that 'it is not the awareness of man which determines his condition but, on the contrary, it is his social condition which determines his awareness'. This statement, previously chiefly used to analyze the attitude of capitalists and the church, now applies to labor itself. When the laboring classes lived in misery, their attitude was revolutionary, but when their social condition improved their revolutionary spirit evaporated and their outlook became evolutionary. For this reason Communist infiltration could be withstood and eliminated by a sound economic policy. Whenever a non-Communist government can provide increasing economic benefits for its people it will offset the demands put forward by Communism and progressively lessen its chances of expansion.

Generally speaking, the Indonesian people place their faith in religion, and religion is basically a dike against the spread of Communism. In spite of this, the bad economic situation in the country and its unrealized ideals open the door to the spread of Communism and have allowed it to make progress in two successive elections, one for parliament and the other for the regional councils. Communism has not spread in Indonesia because of the appeal of its ideology, but because it has promised the people prosperity. It has promised the allocation of land to the landless farming class. Moreover, the Communist Party of Indonesia has been in the vanguard of the struggle for the return of West Irian to the territory of the Republic of Indonesia. When a proper economic policy has begun to benefit visibly the daily livelihood of the people, and when West Irian is incorporated within the Indonesian Republic, the Indonesian Communist Party will lose its main weapons; and by that time the curbing effect of religion can have made its influence felt.

Even though an agreement regarding coexistence and non-intervention would have one result in a country which is Communist and totalitarian and another in a country which is democratic, it nevertheless can reduce tension in international politics in general. It could also be used to determine whether a Communist state

would or would not live up to its obligations. As for the subversive activities which might be carried on by a Communist Party in the domestic affairs of any country, the government has means of checking them. It can protest to the Soviet Union, if it feels that it has a hand in those activities, or it can deal with them directly. When the Communists attempted a *coup d'état* in what has come to be known as the Madiun Incident of September 1948 the Indonesian Government showed the proper firmness and took the swift action which a democratic government should take. In a situation based on coexistence and non-intervention, Moscow loses the right to interfere with a democratic government's action against the Communist movement within its borders. Through the establishment of such a relationship, Indonesia hopes to be able to carry forward constructive activities for the development of its resources in peace.

I am fully aware that the independent and active foreign policy practised by the Indonesian Government, and its shift, in consequence, in the direction of coexistence and non-intervention, is not acceptable to the Government of the United States, which is able to see the world only in its division into two blocs which have no contact between them – namely, what is called the 'free world' and the 'totalitarian Communist world'. But I think the American people, with their high democratic ideals, will agree with me that other peoples can hold different views and still be democratic. A democracy which is intolerant of other viewpoints is no longer democracy but strays into totalitarian ways of thinking.

I think that an atmosphere of peace might speedily be secured if the two greatest world states, the United States and Soviet Russia, would simply make an agreement not to be at war with each other for the next 25 years. Such an agreement would fall short of the ideal by not condemning war for all time, but it would be sufficient to lessen international tensions for the present. In a world filled with psychological enmities, it is difficult to realize hopes and desires which are too idealistic; but a purely realistic decision can produce a climate of peace which in the long run may make hopes and desires which seem too idealistic today become the realities of tomorrow.

The United States and Soviet Russia have demonstrated their skill and recorded their great progress in various fields of knowledge and technology; each in turn overtakes the other in representing a new invention. It would be good if they would compete with each other, and each try to excel the other, in creating an atmosphere

of peace in the world. Indonesia would be one of the beneficiaries.

Indonesia believes that peaceful coexistence among states with opposed ideologies will in time come to pass. Intense rivalries have in the past lost their asperity. Consider, for example, the terrific conflict between capitalism and socialism in the last century. Capitalism, guided by laissez faire and free competition, ruthlessly oppressed labor; it rejected out of hand labor's demand for social welfare. Labor, for its part, thought of class struggle without wanting conciliation. Gradually, the conflict has become less sharp; it is still there but is being carried on in a spirit of conciliation. A good many socialist ideals formerly unceremoniously rejected by capitalists are now defended by them in order to secure social peace in their enterprises. Article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations lays down the foundation for bringing into effect social justice – an ideal which has its roots in the socialistic movement of the nineteenth century. Democratic groupings and social philosophies which previously were at odds are drawing close to each other. The social democratic movement which originated in Europe as a destructive trend now reveals itself as a constructive force aiming to set up the welfare state.

Whereas in the nineteenth century the West was threatened by socialism, today what are termed the 'underdeveloped' countries are exposed to the threat of Communist infiltration. Protected from attack from outside by her active and independent policy based on political coexistence and non-interference, Indonesia seeks to secure domestic stability and construction so that her people can be prosperous. To carry this in effect she needs foreign help, both material and intellectual. She is ready to accept the loan of overseas capital from whatever direction it may be offered, and she desires the assistance of technological and educational experts provided only that they come without any political or other strings. She hopes for a climate of international cooperation in which this aid will be possible.

In carrying her project out Indonesia faces numerous difficulties. One is that the policy outlined is not easily acceptable to the Western world which is tied to the concept of a world divided into blocs. Each act of the Republic of Indonesia which can be construed as turning a smiling face towards Soviet Russia and the People's Republic of China is considered wrong; Indonesia has entered the Communist trap, it is said, as though her leaders were not politically mature. And not infrequently the help given to Indonesia

is measured by her attitude towards those Communist states. It has happened that orders for goods vital to the daily life of the Indonesian people have not been attended to for months. Perhaps Westerners consider this merely as businesslike attitude. But such an occurrence hurts the feelings of Indonesians, and is put down to pride. They feel that an affort is being made to make them realize that they cannot exist without foreign aid, especially from the Western world. They feel they are being asked to go down on their knees in order to obtain it. This feeling of being humiliated automatically makes the thinskinned population react in a way which occasionally seems hostile.

It should not be forgotten that Indonesia is a young country, and that like other newly-emancipated nations she is sensitive and quick to take offense, especially in matters affecting her honor and the necessities for national existence. There is nothing which a nation feels to be so derogatory as to be told that its politics are dictated by other states, and this is all the more true in the case of the Indonesians since their freedom did not come as a gift made in the discretion of the colonial rulers but as the result of a great political struggle. Indonesia adheres to an independent policy in the sense that she is free from the influences of either the United States bloc or the Communist bloc, whether the influence be of capital or of ideology. She is anxious to be friends with all nations, whatever their ideology or system of government. She has her own objective and her own ideology, and she does not want to exchange them for those belonging to others.

These psychological factors should receive careful attention in Western capitalist states, especially the United States, because if they are disregarded the relations of these states with the so-called underdeveloped countries cannot improve and possibly will get worse. Because it is stiff and terribly businesslike, the policy of the United States, even if based on friendship, does not awaken friendly response in the country which receives its help. When it wants to help some country, the United States puts forward too many of its own views and ideas and pays too little attention to the desires and ideals of the nation involved. Everything is measured by American axioms, the American view of life. Consequently the help given by the United States does not produce effective results. Care should be taken to see that American policy towards the newly-emergent states of Asia is not felt to be 'dollar diplomacy'.

It can be stated as a fact that Soviet Russia has a more dynamic

policy and as a result is cleverer in captivating the hearts of the so-called underdeveloped countries. The Soviet political success in the Middle East, in comparison to the failure of Western policy, is due to the fact that the Russians understand better the feelings and national psychology of the Arabs and what they seek. By a policy of strength, by flaunting its wealth, the West will not succeed in getting nearer the minds of the people of the East. However great the material changes among the peoples and states of Asia may be, they make an evaluation in ethical terms, and in their eyes this takes precedence over the economic evaluation. Considerate treatment is more appreciated than a profitable business deal.

Despite what I have said, relations between Indonesia and the United States are fundamentally good and the Indonesian people value the American help which has been given them. The spontaneous reaction of Indonesian public opinion towards tactless or unfriendly treatment does not change the feeling of friendship which is the keynote of the relationship. Nevertheless, there is one vital matter which can obtrude upon those sentiments of friendship, namely the problem of West Irian. This is a national claim by the Republic of Indonesia which cannot be ignored.

The United States stand of neutrality in the feud between Indonesia and the Netherlands over West Irian does, in fact, give support to the Dutch. Because of it, and its adoption by various other states, Indonesia's suggestion in the General Assembly of the United Nations for the opening of discussions with the Netherlands regarding West Irian was never able to muster the necessary two-thirds vote and failed to pass. It has been rejected three times, with the result that relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands are extremely bad.

Indonesians cannot understand why the United States should assume such a halfhearted posture in this matter. The United States has been the moving force in setting up NATO and SEATO to halt the spread of Communist influence and power in Europe and in Asia. Yet to permit West Irian to continue indefinitely as a bone of contention between Indonesia and the Netherlands is to afford Communism an opportunity to spread in Indonesia. The claim to West Irian is a national claim backed by every Indonesian party without exception; but the most demanding voice, apart from that of President Soekarno himself, is that of the Communist Party of Indonesia. By putting itself in the vanguard of those demanding realization of this national ideal, and because it agitates about

West Irian as a national claim – in line with President Soekarno's standpoint – and because it backs this up by good organizational work, the Communist Party of Indonesia is able to capture the imagination of an ever-growing section of the population.

The West Irian question thus represents a tragedy. The United States, the Netherlands and Australia, all equally afraid of the spread of Communism in Southeast Asia, are carrying out a policy which in fact strengthens Communism. For, so long as West Irian is in Dutch hands, that long will the Communist Party of Indonesia be able to carry on a violent agitation, using nationalism as an excuse, to oppose colonialism and thereby touch the soul of the newly-emancipated Indonesian people whose memories are still fresh with the struggle for freedom aganst colonialism. The anti-colonialist feeling is so deeply burnt into the hearts of the Indonesian people that it is incorporated in the Preamble to the Indonesian Constitution. The first sentence of the Preamble says that 'freedom is the right of all peoples and therefore colonialism should be wiped out from the face of this earth because it is opposed to humanity and justice'.

In Indonesian eyes continued Dutch occupation of West Irian is both a remnant of colonialism and an illegal seizure of a portion of Indonesian territory. According to the Linggadjati Agreement of 1947, the term Indonesia embraced the territory of the previous Netherlands East Indies in its entirety. Yet after putting their official signature to the Linggadjati Agreement, the Dutch worked to divorce West Irian from that territory. Doubtless a small section of the Dutch people want it as a reminder of old colonial glory. The 1949 Round Table Conference at The Hague reached no agreement on the question of West Irian. In order that it should not interfere with the transfer of sovereignty to Indonesia, the solution of the problem was, at the suggestion of the United Nations Commission for Indonesia, postponed for a period of a year; but negotiation during that year brought no solution. Meanwhile the Netherlands unilaterally incorporated West Irian within its territory through its constitution. This unilateral action of the Netherlands Government did not in any way affect Indonesia's claim based upon the Linggadjati Agreement. Due to the inability of the United Nations to provide machinery for a solution the West Irian dispute continues.

For the Netherlands this is a tragedy. Its continuing occupation of West Irian has involved it in an expenditure of something like 75 million florins a year. It also endangered the position of the

Netherlands-Indonesian Union – now dissolved – its economic interest in Indonesia and certain advantageous economic relations with Indonesia. The excuse that the Netherlands has a newly-discovered moral obligation towards the people of the territory has no strong foundation. During the days of the Netherlands East Indies the population of West Irian remained exceedingly backward and even at the time of the Linggadjati Agreement no talk was heard about a 'moral obligation' toward them.

For Australia, which supports the Dutch stand, the problem of West Irian is a tragedy also because its policy strengthens the very thing it so strongly opposes – Communism in Indonesia. The thesis that the Netherlands position in West Irian will be a shield for Australia against a Communist attack from the north cannot be proved by any valid argument. The experience of World War II points to the contrary. Actually, an Indonesia that was friendly to Australia would be a much more valuable protection. Although Indonesia is now a young and weak state, the potential energy awaiting development in her rich natural resources, coupled with her large population, will in time make her strong. A strong Indonesia practising an active and independent policy will not be attacked by any country seeking passage in the direction of Australia.

The fear that Indonesia, after obtaining West Irian, would claim East New Guinea is totally unfounded. The Indonesian people do not feel any links of a common lot or history with the people of that area; hence their national claim, historical and juridical in nature, does not extend that far. Apart from boosting Communism in Indonesia, Australia's policy with regard to West Irian can result in a slackening of the ties of friendship between the two countries. This is to be regretted because the Indonesians have a great appreciation of the moral support given them by the people of Australia in the struggle against Dutch colonialism.

One can understand the difficulties raised for the United States by the Indonesian-Netherlands dispute, for it is a friend of both countries. But its so-called neutral attitude creates a tragedy for the United States too. It wants to eradicate Communism, but its policy merely helps it spread. In addition it leaves Indonesia with a sense of grievance. Communist gains in Indonesia, besides alarming the people, have endangered national unity by sharpening conflicts among different sections of the population. Of course West Irian is not the only cause for these Communist gains; other reasons are the low standard of living in Java and the lack of sufficient land to

divide up among the landless farm laborers. Only in the outer islands where the population is scanty is there land to be had for the asking. But this can be put to use only in connection with transmigration on a big scale and this involves expenses which the state cannot afford. Thus the question has not only social but financial aspects. Meanwhile the all-pervasive influence of the West Irian question upon sentiment and politics has no little effect in retarding reconstruction. Anyone who wants to say that this is a tragedy for Indonesia is free to do so. Indeed, till the question of West Irian is settled Indonesian politics will be more irrational than rational.

The above description portrays clearly that the problem of colonialism casts its shadow upon the friendly relations between the Western world and the Asian-African nations in general and Indonesia in particular. This does not mean that Indonesia will turn her back on the West. Her intellectual and cultural relations with the Western world are too many and too deeply rooted in history for that. But because Indonesia is fed up with the policies of the West she will develop relations with the other nations of the East and will culturally enrich herself. Her active and independent foreign policy, based upon the fundamental necessities of existence, forbid her from drawing close to one bloc at the expense of the other. While safeguarding this basis of friendship with all nations, the nature of her relationship in practice will be determined in each case by what is at that time the reigning national interest.

Looked at from afar, Indonesia today seems to be in chaos and confusion. Many of the outer regions appear to be in turbulence and opposed to the Central Government. The foreign press represents this as a revolt of the regions. But alongside this turbulence consultations are going on between the Central Government and regional civil and military authorities on ways to overcome the national difficulties. It is hard for outsiders to understand what is happening. However paradoxical it may sound, none of the dissidents intend to bring about fissuring and separatism. They aim to strengthen the unity of the people based upon the proclamation of independence of August 17th, 1945, and to ensure a strong government blessed with authority and supreme over all the regions. Further, all the incidents and turbulence which have occurred in Indonesia, beginning with President Soekarno's breathing life into his National Council and continuing with the military's seizure of authority from civil hands in the outer regions, are a reaction and

protest against a wrong turning taken by Indonesian democracy in the direction of party oligarchy, anarchy and corruption. Formally and juridically all these steps are wrong, even though they are meant to speed up reconstruction and to revitalize democracy which, as the Indonesian people understand it, is not political only but also economic and social.

The conflicts in Indonesia are frightful to behold, but if they are carefully examined they are not on the level of the civil war which the United States experienced after freeing itself from British control. If Indonesia can get over this temporary confusion she will carry ahead speedily her constructive work and obtain more time in which to strengthen her bonds of friendship with all nations, those of the Western world not excepted.

First published in *Foreign Affairs, An American Quarterly Review*, April 1958.

1. People in the West often term the Communist bloc the 'Eastern bloc', a term which really is not apt because many Asian countries are accustomed to calling themselves Eastern nations.

47 Colonialism and the danger of war

IN THE WORLD TODAY problems of war and peace are at the center of everyone's thoughts. The Berlin question has become acute since Prime Minister Khrushchev's announcement that he would sign a peace treaty with East Germany before the end of this year. The question of banning nuclear-weapons tests is a daily topic of conversation at diplomatic gatherings as well as in barber shops. Conferences on disarmament, which started during the time of the League of Nations, are still in session. The world outlook is gloomy rather than hopeful.

One of several vexed problems in the chess game of international politics concerns colonialism, a matter that is not sufficiently understood in the West. Although it is true that many former colonies have become independent states since World War II, there are still countries which desire to perpetuate and to strengthen colonialism. There was a time when colonial imperialism dominated international politics. But the course of history since World War I has favored the independence of nations. Meanwhile the family of independent states has grown steadily larger.

World War I brought independence to a number of oppressed nations in Central Europe and opened the door to independence for several colonized countries. World War II furthered the process. A great many colonized countries have become independent and have joined the United Nations. Hence it is hypocrisy to suppose that colonialism can be prolonged. To gaze backwards, pining for the days of old 'colonial glory', is extremely dangerous.

Present developments display clear proof that colonialism creates a warlike spirit. The colonized nations are opening their eyes wider and are giving increasing thought to obtaining their independence as quickly as possible, the more so since they have seen so many of their sister nations become sovereign and independent. Does mankind need World War III to complete this process, which can be

delayed no longer? The disaster that would be caused by a third world war we all know. And, as civilized and intelligent human beings, we must do our utmost to prevent it. If the validity of this statement is acknowledged, why are the fires of colonialism allowed to go on burning, for they will surely set the whole world aflame in a war of annihilation?

The peoples of the Western world are afraid primarily of communism, the influence and power of which increased after each world war. Is the West now preparing to accept another war – a war fostered by the spirit of colonialism – and thus invite communist control of the whole world? This will be an ineluctable consequence.

Each nation, no matter how backward it may be, has the right to independence. Once a nation has become convinced of the rightness of its cause, the ideal of independence can no longer be suppressed, as the histories of India and of Indonesia have demonstrated. Additional evidence may be seen today in the Congo. The ultimate independence of nations that are still colonies is not a matter for argument; it is only a matter of time. In this respect many lessons may be learned from the policy of Britain, which understood and acted wisely in regard to India. By recognizing the inevitable and by granting independence to India voluntarily, Britain forged a close friendship with India, which has largely forgotten the past. In striking contrast are the narrow attitudes taken by France with regard to Indochina and Algeria and by Holland vis-à-vis Indonesia. Independence that has been achieved by force of arms fosters vengeful sentiments that are not easily forgotten.

THE CONFLICT between Indonesia and the Netherlands, which has become increasingly threatening to world peace, has its origin in the colonial question, namely, in the problem of West Irian, or West New Guinea, as it is still called in the official colonial language of the West. Indonesia regards West Irian as a part of its territory, while the Netherlands claims the right to maintain its colonial rule there – naturally under the pretext of fulfilling its so-called sacred mission of preparing the population for self-government! Here we have a moral argument which the Dutch ignored previously and which they discovered only after they were obliged to relinquish sovereignty over the former Netherlands Indies to Indonesia.

This conflict cannot end until West Irian has been ceded to Indonesia. Every endeavor of the Dutch Government to defer the

transfer of West Irian to Indonesia only complicates the problem and creates an atmosphere of mounting tension. Mr. Luns, the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs, recently declared in the General Assembly of the United Nations that the Netherlands was ready to place West Irian under United Nations Trusteeship, and pledged that the Netherlands would continue as before to contribute financially to the development of the territory. In this statement he spoke more like a desperate man than a wise politician, for he was well aware that such a proposal would not affect a solution, since it is unacceptable to Indonesia as a major party to the conflict. If the Netherlands is in fact willing to relinquish sovereignty over West Irian, then why not to Indonesia, which has claimed that disputed land as part of its national territory from the very beginning?

It is worth recalling the origin of the conflict. Article III of the 1947 Linggadjati Agreement, between the Netherlands Government and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, states:
'The United States of Indonesia shall comprise the entire territory of the Netherlands Indies, with the provision, however, that in case the population of any territory, after due consultation with the other territories, should decide by democratic process that they are not, or not yet, willing to join the United States of Indonesia, they may establish a special relationship on behalf of such territory with the United States of Indonesia and with the Kingdom of the Netherlands.'

Clearly, according to this article, the Netherlands undertook to relinquish the entire territory of the Netherlands Indies. As for the provisional exception, no part of Indonesia gave notice before the transfer of sovereignty that it was not, or not yet, willing to join the United States of Indonesia. And it is well known that any separatist movement occurring *after* Indonesia had become independent was of Dutch manufacture, sponsored and led by units of the Dutch colonial army before their repatriation.

Disagreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Netherlands over implementation of the Linggadjati Agreement provided a welcome pretext for the Dutch to launch their first military action, which began in July 1947 and was halted only through the intervention of the United Nations Security Council. Under the auspices of the Good Offices Committee, the Renville Agreement was signed between Indonesia and the Netherlands in January 1948. This was a truce agreement which stipulated that the four principles of the Linggadjati Agreement should form a basis for political

discussions. These principles provided for the independence of the Indonesian peoples; cooperation between the peoples of the Netherlands and Indonesia; a sovereign Indonesian state on a federal basis and under a constitution that was to be formulated by democratic processes; and a union comprising the United States of Indonesia and other parts of the Kingdom of the Netherlands under the Queen of the Netherlands.

At that time the Dutch had no intention yet of separating West Irian from the main body of Indonesia, nor was there any mention of such action during the negotiations that followed. The idea was not advanced until after the second military action, when it became clear to everybody that the Dutch-Indonesia conflict could be terminated only by a transfer of sovereignty without an interim transitional period. Plans were subsequently laid for a round-table conference that should have but one objective: the transfer of sovereignty over the former Netherlands Indies to the Government of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia.

For many Dutch people, who had grown grey in the colonial service, it was very hard to accept the loss of Indonesia. Involved was a loss both of prestige and of what had long been called 'the cork supporting the welfare of the Netherlands'. The financial loss could be offset by an economic agreement favoring Dutch interests in Indonesia. But the loss of prestige? Memories of former 'colonial glory' could be kept alive only by retaining some part of the former Netherlands Indies under Dutch control. Hence the notion of excluding West Irian from the transfer of sovereignty. Dutch reservations concerning West Irian were mentioned for the first time at the Round Table Conference preparatory meeting in April 1949 at Djakarta, which produced the so-called Roem-Royen Agreement.

At the Round Table Conference at The Hague the Dutch tried to defend their new position by referring to Article III of the Linggadjati Agreement. But they soon admitted the logic of the positions of both Indonesian delegations, which denied the applicability of Article III to the inhabitants of West Irian as long as the great majority of them were not in a position to express their desires. Accordingly, under the terms of the Linggadjati Agreement, the Netherlands was obliged to transfer West Irian to Indonesia. Nevertheless, the Dutch insisted on holding West Irian, and were disinclined to listen to opposing arguments.

In an atmosphere of mounting tension the parties agreed to a United Nations formula calling for the maintenance of the status

quo in West Irian, with the stipulation that, within a year after the transfer of sovereignty to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, the question of West Irian's political status should be determined by negotiation between the governments. After repeated negotiations proved unsuccessful, the Dutch refused to participate in further discussions on the West Irian issue. To the Indonesian contention that the area was part of Indonesia just as it had been part of the Netherlands Indies before the transfer of sovereignty, the Dutch replied that there could be no question of a transfer of sovereignty without prior consultation of the inhabitants of West Irian, who would be permitted to exercise the right of self-determination at the appropriate time.

In retaliation against the Dutch withdrawal from their former Linggadjati position, the only course open to the Indonesian Government involved abrogation of the Dutch-Indonesia Union in 1956, followed by confiscation of Dutch properties in Indonesia as a temporary *political* countermove to the Dutch retention of West Irian. The final step taken by the Indonesian Government was the severing of diplomatic relations with the Netherlands.

INDONESIA'S claim to West Irian represents a continuation of her struggle against colonialism, a struggle to complete her national independence. In this effort to achieve the highest ideal there is no place for compromise, as history in all periods had demonstrated. In the course of the accompanying excitement, armed conflict can hardly be avoided. Any such clash of arms, no matter how small, could set off a new world war with all its disastrous consequences for mankind.

Indonesia's claim to West Irian is supported by public opinion in most of Asia and Africa, which have similar problems. It goes without saying that communist countries as well back Indonesia.

The Asian-African Conference at Bandung unanimously declared that 'colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end'. Since then many African peoples have become independent; and as more peoples become independent, anti-colonial sentiment will become stronger in the world.

The people of the United States, recalling their own history, are anti-colonialist by sentiment. But this sentiment alone is not enough. The United States should actively demonstrate its antipathy for colonialism and should try energetically to wipe out this symbol of

injustice. Its indifferent attitude toward colonial conflicts undercuts its own endeavors to maintain world peace.

Like it or not, a basic prerequisite for settling the problems of the present-day world is the recognition of the right of every nation to be independent. Any qualification of this recognition, whatever its pretext, should be condemned. Such recognition should be followed by joint efforts to make independence meaningful and to assist the economically underdeveloped nations in shaping their societies according to their own ideals.

First published in *Asian Survey*, Vol. 1, no. 9, November 1961.

48 One Indonesian view of the Malaysia issue

Indonesia underwent several decades of struggle before finally gaining independence. Many patriots sacrificed themselves for their country. Dozens of leaders were jailed or lived miserably in exile. But the leaders of Indonesia's freedom struggle were not solely concerned with a free Indonesia; they also demanded the liberation of all peoples from every type of colonial domination and oppression. Once Indonesia had achieved independence, the ending of colonialism everywhere became one of the objectives of its foreign policy. This objective was even incorporated into the Preamble to the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states that: 'freedom is truly the right of all peoples and therefore colonial domination throughout the world should be abolished, because it is contrary to the principles of humanitarianism and justice'. Besides building up a free, united, sovereign, just and prosperous Indonesia, the Preamble concludes, the government of Indonesia shall 'participate in all efforts to bring about a new world based on freedom, eternal peace and social justice'. It is, therefore, the duty of every Indonesian government to carry out this policy of freedom for all peoples, because this policy is formulated in the Preamble to the Constitution together with the Pantjasila, the five basic principles of the State philosophy.

Indonesia has no territorial claims whatsoever beyond the area of the former Netherlands Indies. From the very beginning Indonesian nationalism was not determined by identical origin, identiccal language or identical religion, but had its basis in the realization of various component parts that they formed one entity with a common destiny and purpose. Under Dutch colonial domination, which lasted for more than 300 years, the different ethnic groups in the former Netherlands Indies became aware of sharing the same destiny. It is this phenomenon that provided the base for Indonesian nationalism and thereby defined the territorial limits of

the present free and unified Republic of Indonesia. Although the inhabitants of North Borneo, under British colonial domination, share the same islands and are of the same race, Indonesia does not demand that this area become Indonesian territory. The same applies to the attitude of Indonesian nationalism towards the part of the island Timor under Portuguese domination. Beyond the area of the former Netherlands Indies, Indonesia has no territorial aspirations. Now, as West Irian which the Dutch tried to keep separate has been returned, Indonesia has acquired all its own territory.

However, under the principle to which it has adhered from the beginning, it is Indonesia's desire that the neighboring areas under British domination should also become free. Britain has given independence to India, Burma and Ceylon; why then are Malaya, Singapore and North Borneo not given independence as well? Malaya, the homeland of the Malays, is entitled to its own state. Singapore with 90% of its population Chinese who have lived there for a hundred years and which has a character of its own, is also entitled to be a separate state, free both from British domination and from domination by the government of its original home country, the Chinese People's Republic. Also the population of North Borneo, mainly of Malay and Indonesian descent, is entitled to its own national identity.

Thus Indonesia has always envisaged on its borders the existence of three free states that were former colonies. Together with the Philippines to the northeast, there would then be five independent countries in Southeast Asia, liberated from a colonial past. These five countries could cooperate in mutual understanding, mutual assistance and mutual respect to protect their common interests and their ideals of eternal peace. As stipulated in the Preamble of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the freedom of these countries is one of the objectives of Indonesia's foreign policy.

In the middle of November 1949, after the Round Table Conference in The Hague, I spent one night in Singapore on my way back to Indonesia. Malcolm MacDonald, at that time the British High Commissioner in Southeast Asia, invited me for dinner in Johore Baru together with several prominent local officials. On that occasion I said to him:

'Now that Indonesia has become an independent country, I hope that Britain will also grant independence to Malaya, Singapore, and North Borneo. By doing so, Britain would only continue what she has started doing with India. It would make me very happy to

see a Free Malaya, a Free Singapore and a Free North Borneo beside our Free Indonesia.'

MacDonald replied that it was indeed Britain's intention to grant independence to these territories, but not as three separate states. Fragmentation into three separate states, he stated, would be apt to weaken each of them, hence it would be more suitable if the three areas were united together in one state.

My answer was that if this policy were adopted, the new state that would emerge would inevitably become a second China, dominated both politically and economically by the Chinese. The Singapore Chinese would then be able to extend their power throughout the entire area, and together with the Chinese in Malaya, would no doubt achieve a preponderant position at the expense of the Malays, who would thereby lose their own country. This would not only be very dangerous for the Malays themselves, but also for us Indonesians. Such a second China would probably become an ally and accomplice of mainland China, since it is well known that expatriate Chinese customarily maintain a strong feeling of kinship with their home country. It would soon become a communist country. Such a second China, created by the British, could lead to class struggle and racial strife that might easily flare up into a class war and a racial war. In a country that is politically and economically dominated by the Chinese, the Malays and Dayaks would become the oppressed groups. A country that is faced with racial struggle within its borders, is bound to remain weak and in danger of collapse. Therefore, I said, it would be much better for Britain, when granting independence to its colonies in Southeast Asia, to set up three separate countries, this being the only logical division: the State of Malaya for the Malays, the State of Singapore for the Chinese, and the State of North Borneo for those who are of Malay-Indonesian stock together with those Chinese who are old-time residents.

MacDonald then argued that in reality Malaya could not be called a country of Malaya, because it was a multi-racial country. Less than half the population was of Malay stock; the Chinese numbered about 40%, whereas at least 15% belonged to other racial groups, such as Indians and various mixtures. In North Borneo the Chinese comprise about 30 to 35% of the population. It was true that in a combination of Singapore and Malaya the Chinese would be in the majority. But in a combination of the three countries there would be a reasonable balance as the Chinese would then no longer be in the majority.

Although I stressed once more that the composition of the population would in no way lessen the spread of Chinese economic hegemony with its political effect, our conversation was not pursued any further. Our two points of view were so far apart that it was impossible to finish our discussions during a dinner party. I could only draw the conclusion that Great Britain had definitely decided to combine these three areas, in spite of their different characteristics, into one state, a member of the Commonwealth. Diplomacy was the only way left open to Indonesia to try and bring about a change in British policy. Efforts were made via diplomatic channels to convince London that the creation of three separate countries would be the best way to terminate its colonial status in Southeast Asia, in order to ensure social prosperity for all of them. After the formation of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, in which I held the offices of Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, I issued instructions to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, that our point of view, as explained by me to MacDonald, should be considered as one of the most important aspects of our Government's foreign policy.

My conviction that the formation of 'Malaysia' would result in the elimination of a state which the Malay people could call their own, and its de facto replacement by a second China, became even stronger after my visit to Malaya in mid-1962. Although Malaya was officially the country of the Malay people and its higher officials were generally Malays, more than 70% of its urban population was Chinese. Anyone having an opportunity to observe conditions during even a short visit to Malayan cities cannot avoid the impression that he is in China. The Malays themselves are only to be found in the villages. The dominant position of the Chinese is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the Malayan government has found it necessary to set up hundreds of modern small farmer enterprises which are allotted to Malays. For this purpose a special Ministry was set up, called the Ministry of Community Development, under the personal supervision of Tun Abdul Razak. In the cities there is no scope for the Malays; for their economic welfare they depend on the new small-scale enterprises being set up in the villages.

I also found it interesting to note the Ministry of Information's energetic efforts to propagate the use of Malay as the national language. The Chinese in Malaya, even those who have lived there for several generations, make no effort to speak Malay, but persist

in using the language of their forefathers, Chinese. The Chinese intellectuals use English in their conversation. Essentially, the Chinese in Malaya consider Malay an inferior language, and do not take the trouble to learn it. They are proud of being Chinese, even when working as servants of wealthy Malays. The Chinese houseboy or cook or laundry boy always speaks his or her own language; the employer can only make himself understood to his employee if he can speak some Chinese. During a conversation with an official of Chinese origin, I mentioned the expression 'Tionghoa', which is the usual term for Chinese in Indonesia. He immediately said: 'What do you mean, Tionghoa? I am Chinese', a name he was proud of. This was in fact not surprising, because in his mind he was still imbued with the traditional British colonial attitude in which the whites form the upper class, the Chinese the middle class and the Malays the lower class.

The attitude of the overseas Chinese in Malaya is completely different from that of their counterparts in Indonesia. The 'Tionghoa peranakan' (the Chinese who have lived here for generations) do not want to be called Chinese, but consider themselves as Indonesian citizens of Chinese descent. Generally speaking, their feelings are those of Indonesian nationals, with the same national ideals. Their grandparents may still speak Chinese, but they themselves do not. Before Indonesian became the national language – that is, in the former Netherlands Indies – the Chinese used to speak the language of the region in which they lived. If they were born in Central or East Java, they spoke Javanese. If they were born in West Java, they spoke Sundanese. If they were born in Minangkabau, they spoke Minankabau. Chinese intellectuals and those with Western education learned to speak Dutch and 'pasar' Malay, over and above their own regional language. In those days, the Chinese newspaper were written in 'pasar' Malay or in 'Chinese-Malay', a mixed language closely related to Malay. These langauages no longer exist and have since been replaced by the Indonesian language.

Why is there such a difference in mentality between the overseas Chinese in Malaya and those in Indonesia? The reason is that before World War II there was no national movement demanding an independent Malaya. This national feeling only came into existence after the emergence of several new independent and sovereign nations in Southeast and South Asia. During the Dutch colonial period a national movement had already become active in Indone-

sia, and exerted a strong influence upon the Chinese community in Indonesia. In addition, this national movement and the Partai Serikat Islam, which included a number of Chinese among its membership, the Partai Tionghoa-Indonesia, a 'Tionhoa-peranakan' party under the leadership of Liem Koen Hian, was also striving towards Indonesian independence; its members wanted to give up Chinese nationality and become Indonesian citizens once Indonesia became free. Thus, the Indonesian freedom movement during the Dutch colonial period influenced the development of Indonesian national feelings among the Chinese in Indonesia. At present they no longer like to be called Chinese, but only Indonesians. The course of history in Indonesia has gradually made them real Indonesians. Only their names remind one of the country from which their ancestors came; their language and way of life are Indonesian.

The history of the Chinese in Malaya and their present strong position in that country, however, will not make them Malays. They will remain Chinese and due to their activities they will retain their economic, social and political dominance. In order to protect the Malays, weak as they are in all respects, economically, politically, and socially, and in order that the Malays will have their own country and their own free state, it is necessary that independent Malaya stand on its own. The creation of a 'Malaysia' is nothing but the creation of a second China using the mask of 'Malay', a new colony dominated by Chinese capitalists, oppressing the Malay nation.

I have often discussed this matter with Malay leaders, both in Djakarta and in various places in Malaya itself. It is my impression that most of them – though not all of them – are pleased with the aims of 'Malaysia', without having considered in any depth the consequences for their own nation. Some of them even told me that the creation of Malaysia should be considered an internal matter for the three groups concerned; they requested my moral support as a friend from a country whose policy is opposed to interference in the internal affairs of another country.

I replied, as I also have done in public: 'The creation of Malaysia will become a sound policy if it is supported by the peoples of the countries concerned'. History will provide the correct answer, and history alone will provide the right appraisal of my view!

First published in *Asian Survey*, Vol. V, no. 3, March 1965.

49 Asian countries in the changing world

At the end of the nineteenth century, one could still say that the world consisted of two parts: a dynamic part and a static one. The Western world was the dynamic one while the static part consisted of Asia, to which Africa might be added.

This situation began to change with the outbreak of the war between Japan and Russia, in 1904, which ended with Japan's victory. The sound of the guns being fired in Tsushima announced, as it were, to the whole world that the Asian nations had begun to wake up. Japan's victory over Russia was regarded by the Asians as their own victory over the white people. They looked upon the defeat of Czarist Russia as a defeat of the white race.

Not long afterwards nationalistic movements arose practically everywhere in Asia. Where these national movements had already started, as in India, their character became radical. From 1919 on, the Indian Congress Party, at the instigation of Mahatma Gandhi, pursued a policy of non-cooperation and non-violence.

In China, the national movement was succesful in bringing down the Manchu empire and replacing it with a Chinese republic under Sun Yat-sen. Although Sun Yat-sen himself was not long in power, the movement went on and the Manchu dynasty did not return. The aim of the Chinese revolution in 1911 was to raise the level of living of the Chinese people and to bring about modernization as quickly as possible. However, the sudden change from a static situation to a dynamic process could not be carried out in an orderly way. After the downfall of the static empire, the power fell into the hands of dynamic warlords who divided China into two or more parts, each fighting the other.

When China was reunited by Chiang Kai-shek, it proved impossible to start the modernization process in accordance with Sun Yat-sen's doctrine of San Min Chu'i, embodying nationalism, democracy, and prosperity of the people. The antagonism within the

society continued under the influence of foreign teachings. Only Japan was fortunate in its modernization which in fact had already been in operation since the so-called 'Meiji restoration'. Japan was able to receive Western knowledge in technical as well as cultural aspects while adapting it to Japan's own culture. This, in fact, is the best way: not adopting but adapting Western culture.

The effect of Japan's victory over Russia in 1905 can also be seen in the emergence of the national movement in Indonesia since 1908. The people's organizations moved ahead fast, and they urged the colonial government to grant home rule to Indonesia as soon as possible. The colonized people, who felt themselves left far behind the other nations in every respect, demanded that modernization be carried out as quickly as possible. The colonizers, however, wanted to bring it about gradually, step by step. This caused a psychological conflict between the colonized and the colonizer which grew more and more serious until it finally could no longer be solved peacefully. Thus the dynamic process in all colonial areas of Asia went on by fits and starts.

With the exception of the Philippines! The Americans came to the Philippines not to colonize but to expand Western culture to those islands. The U.S. government declared from the beginning that it would educate the people of the Philippines as fast as possible so that they could acquire self-government. In 1936 they did get self-government and, moreover, received the promise that ten years thence the Philippines would be independent.

Japan, which was the first to awaken, was able to catch up gradually with Europe. At first this was done through imitation, later by their own achievement. After the first world war, Japan already occupied the fourth place among the world's big nations. Not just in the areas of science, economics, and politics did Japan compete with the other big nations, but also in making a bid for world power. The latter, as we know, resulted in the breakdown of Japan's power in World War II. Thanks to U.S. assistance, Japan was able to get on its feet again. Japan's militarism, which had become the cause of its downfall, disappeared, but its economy came back to life. Its science and technology progressed more and more, to the admiration of the whole world.

The dynamic process in Asia, which progressed so haltingly and therefore caused antagonisms, was bound to result in the abolishment of those antagonisms, namely, by achieving independence. After World War II the colonized countries achieved their inde-

pendence in a variety of ways. The Philippines, Burma, India, Pakistan and Ceylon received their independence from the U.S. and Britain in a peaceful way. Therefore, their public administration did not become disrupted. The changes affected merely political entities such as the heads of state, parliaments, and governments.

The situation in Indonesia and Vietnam was very different. After Indonesia proclaimed her independence on the 17th of August, 1945, she fought for four years against the Dutch who wanted to resume their colonial regime in Indonesia. This psychological conflict, which could not be solved by the force of arms, ended with the Round Table Conference in The Hague. At the end of 1949, the Netherlands officially recognized Indonesia's independence. Her territory covered the area of the former Dutch East Indies with the exception of West Irian (Western New Guinea) where they wanted to continue their power. This was a great mistake of the Dutch and, in fact, it was of no use. West Irian became a contested area. In the end, they still had to surrender it in 1962. However, the fact that the Dutch government held on to it for twelve years caused political and psychological conflicts which mounted with the years that went by.

It was at that time that President Soekarno had the chance to carry out his agitation against the Netherlands, vigorously assisted by the Indonesian Communist Party. If the Netherlands had not followed such a misguided policy, the dynamic process in Indonesia would have progressed more quietly and Soekarno might have become an agitator for development. Meanwhile, much had already been destroyed which proved hard to resurrect. The democratic ideals for which the national movement had fought during the Dutch colonial period and which began to be implemented after independence were diverted by Soekarno in the direction of dictatorship under the name of guided democracy. This dictatorship based on emotion could not build up the country and, following its destiny, was bound to collapse in the end. The P.K.I. coup d'état that failed on October 1, 1965, was also instrumental in putting an end to Soekarno's dictatorship.

Vietnam went through a dynamic process that was very similar to the one experienced in Indonesia. Right from the beginning a great deal of antagonism was involved in the process. At the end of World War II, Ho Chi Minh declared Vietnam's independence, but France held on to its sovereignty. That was the cause of a new

colonial war which lasted many years and ended only after the French army experienced a serious defeat at Dien Bien Phu. The conference held to solve the Vietnam problem in Geneva in 1954 did not result in a final settlement. Vietnam was, provisionally, divided in two parts. North Vietnam came under the rule of Ho Chi Minh, and South Vietnam was ruled by the aristocracy under Ngo Dien Diem. Laos and Cambodia became two independent monarchies. After two years, Vietnam was expected to be united through general elections. From the beginning, it was a fair guess that the general elections based on the Geneva agreement would not take place. After two years, North Vietnam demanded that they be held. South Vietnam refused. To protect South Vietnam and prevent it from being swallowed up by North Vietnam, the U.S. sent troops to that country. This was the beginning of the undeclared war between the U.S. and North Vietnam for which even now no definite solution has been found.

In countries where there are certain groups struggling for power, such as the feudalists, the nationalists, and the communists, it is difficult to achieve a lasting peace. The same is true for those countries that are territorially split into two parts, one ruled by communists, the other by nationalists. Such a division already contains in itself a conflict situation. The communists' philosophy of life is expansion, for their aim is to make the whole world communistic. Poverty is a close friend of communism, and general prosperity constitutes an obstacle to its spread.

In Western nations, called the prosperous nations, communism has lost its influence. Therefore, prosperity of the people is the most powerful weapon in the fight against the spread of communism. A nation that is extremely poor and whose people 'have nothing but the chains that shackle their existence' may easily become revolutionary and be ready to fight in order to overcome its poverty. As Marx himself said, in his discussion of Historical Materialism: 'It is not the awareness of the people that detetermines their social existence but quite on the contrary, it is their social existence that determines their awareness'.

The workers in prosperous countries already have possessions so they don't want to become revolutionaries and participate in destroying those goods. A similar process will also come about in communist countries, particularly in the Soviet Union, when the time comes that their workers possess amenities in their homes such as radio, television, a car, etc. The Soviet government just

awarded a franchise to the Fiat manufacturing company to establish an automobile factory in the Soviet Union. This is something that would have been unthinkable approximately twenty years ago.

When we observe things more closely, we find that it is not communism that is most dangerous for the whole world in the time to come, nor even nuclear power that threatens to destroy; it is rather the present division of the world into two large parts: the rich countries and those that are poor. The rich countries are able to build up their industries at a fast rate because they have full industrial resources and their production techniques are constantly improving, whereas in the developing nations, development always meets with many obstacles.

The increasing gap between progressing nations and those that do not progress so well constitutes a great danger which should not be neglected. This situation will make international trade difficult. The terms of exchange are always to the disadvantage of countries that are not developing well and in the end the exchange will stop entirely. The result will be that this world will be divided up into sections that are separate and antagonistic, and this could very easily cause an atavistic attitude, such as we have experienced in recent times.

It is for this reason that the problem of development has become so extremely important at this time. How can a harmonious development be brought about in this world in such a way that the growing gap between the developed nations and those that are developing could be diminished at this time, so that in the end prosperity and social justice can be spread evenly over the whole world? The Asian nations that have become independent after World War II have as their main aim development in order to catch up with the Western countries in various areas. No matter how far they have strayed from this initial aim under the influence of emotional and irrational factors – as was the case, for example, in Indonesia – their aims are still in no way different from those of democratic countries where there is social justice and prosperity. Will it be possible for these Asian nations to develop their countries under their own steam and without foreign assistance?

Before answering this question, let us first establish – be it only at a glance – what it is that we call development. Since my time is limited, I shall not present a variety of existing viewpoints about development. Let it suffice to accept the view that the economy of a state is progressing if the following conditions are fulfilled:

first, that its national income – either the national income as a whole or the per capita income – shows an increase greater than the rise of prices for commodities; and second, that the yearly increase in the working population can be absorbed in the industries, with, every year, sufficient new capital formation to provide employment for the new generation of job seekers and also to put an end, gradually, to 'disguised unemployment'. Development has to aim at a community in which there is no longer any unemployment nor poverty and where social justice is practiced towards the achievement of this end. Economic and political policies have to be completely adjusted to that aim.

The progressive nations in the West, whose industries are geneally well developed, pay for their development planning out of their yearly savings. In the West, as a rule, 20 per cent of the national income is used for economic development. Temporary deficits can be overcome by borrowing money on the capital market and money market and, if necessary, from international banks. These countries have an immense industrial apparatus. The amounts of money set aside for depletion costs, yearly reserves for new construction, and all sorts of other reserves, are very large. Institutes whose activities are entirely in investment are also quite numerous. For Western industrial countries it is therefore no great problem to acquire capital for yearly development.

The situation is very different for Asian nations who want to develop. In the Asian nations that are emerging, the industries – except in Japan – are small and weak and therefore cannot be financed out of their yearly savings. Its inhabitants, who live on a minimum existence level, are unable to save. These countries, moreover, have to cope with disguised unemployment, temporarily shouldered by relatives who are themselves poor, and with an excessive population increase which yearly reaches a higher percentage.

If such economically backward nations want to develop, it can only be done with outside help. Even India, which was not troubled by emotional and irrational factors at the time it received its independence from England and was therefore able to develop its economy in a quiet and orderly manner according to a five-years-plan, is still faced which obstacles in the course of its development and needs aid from rich countries such as the U.S., Britain and Australia.

But such aid is not in line with its purpose if it is given with political strings attached. Economic aid tied to political conditions will indeed be regarded by these developing nations, most of whom

acquired their independence after World War II, as a first step in the direction of neo-colonialism.

Development aid therefore must be free from any political conditions, free from intervention in the internal politics of the countries that are to receive aid.

But financial aid given outright to a developing country with the sole aim of relieving her of her financial difficulties is not, in fact, 'development aid'. Such aid would have the character of philantrophy. It would not help the countries faced with those difficulties to learn how to overcome them by hard work and saving. Such aid can only lead the receiving countries on the road towards extravagance and lack of responsibility.

Aid should be given by providing long-term loans at a low interest rate. There is little use in asking whether short-term or middle-term credits could be of help to developing countries, for five- to ten-year loans at an interest rate of 5 per cent or more constitute a very heavy burden for developing countries. The country is forced to return the borrowed capital in a very short time. No sooner are the new industries established than the problem of returning the borrowed capital has to be faced. This inhibits thinking about the development of the rest of the country.

This is the reason why development credit has to be long-term with a low interest rate. The rate should not be higher than 3 to $3^1/_2$ per cent a year.

For the development of various types of industry, the period should be between ten and twenty years, depending on the moment the returns are beginning to come in. For the construction of a canal, a dam, or electric power, harbor, and other projects that are part of the infrastructure, the credit term can be extended beyond twenty years.

Development credit, in the true sense, is credit that promotes national development and insures that it progresses in an orderly way.

Fundamentally, the national economic development of developing nations has to be carried out, as much as possible, by the people themselves, inspired by ideals of 'self-help' and self-confidence. The purpose of outside help is to develop the resources present in the country itself. Such help alleviates the burden of the developing country and promotes the development of its economy until it reaches a certain level from which it is able to take off on its own. Further assistance may in some cases be necessary, but such help has a complementary character.

Therefore, development aid should be in the form of long-term credit at a low interest rate. The loan should be paid back in installments that correlate with the income derived from the project established with that credit.

It should be realized from the beginning that development aid is, essentially, not based on philanthrophy. It is indeed based on healthy economic judgment. A smooth economic process in the new Asian nations will also expedite international exchange. The Western economies, that are in danger of becoming stagnant because of the imbalance between them and the underdeveloped countries, can thereby avoid stagnation. Therefore, these Western nations that help developing countries do so in their own interest. Only with a balanced economy can world prosperity be achieved and world peace be assured. A serious disparity between the rich and the poor will endanger world development, as we have already seen repeatedly in the past. Bringing about a balance of prosperity between the nations of the world means providing a guaranty for the perpetuation of coexistence in this narrowing world.

Aid given by the Western world to Asian nations is a condition sine qua non for the promotion of development in Asian countries. On the other hand, the Asian nations themselves have to learn to work according to an orderly plan. Attempts should be made to bring idealism and reality closer together.

Idealism should become the guiding principle in carrying out development projects. Reality constitutes the facts to be faced in development work. Idealism has no limits; it can become fantasy. Reality, however, has many aspects, many boundaries. Every action in the real world is always determined by space, time, and the factor of potentiality.

People often ask why it is that in the West science progresses and technology develops to ever greater heights in spite of the fact that the Asian nations had science and philosophy before the West did. Before Western people began to think in an orderly fashion, knowledge – especially about such serious subjects as mathematics, physics, and philosophy – already flourished in the Asian world, particularly in China and India. But this knowledge has been lost for centuries on the Asian continent; what remained was a philosophy of life. The Western peoples who learned at the feet of teachers from the East, Asians, were able to raise the subjects they studied to the highest level, whereas the Asian nations, who were the first to have such profound ideas, lost the knowledge they possessed.

I think the reason for this lies in their different ways of thinking. Asians think without limitations; their thinking penetrates nature. The basis of their thinking primarily lies in seeking answers to the questions: What is the origin of this world? In what direction is it going? What keeps it together? The Western peoples who learned from the Eastern peoples, the Asians, are capable of outlining their problems, and problem solving became the sole aim of their knowledge.

Ever since his emergence in the world of thought with the philosophy expounded in his *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Critique of Pure Reason), Immanuel Kant divided nature into two parts: a perceivable world and one that cannot be perceived, the world of metaphysics. The task of scientists is limited to the perceivable world, and their way of thinking is bound to the categories of space, time, and causality. By using this way of thinking, the Western people were able to investigate the perceivable world both in theory and in practice. Moreover, with the progress made by science and technology the boundaries of the perceivable world became increasingly wider. Oriental people are also able to think in categories of space, time, and causality. In addition, however, they emphasize thinking in terms of contemplation.

In facing development problems, we Asians have to change our way of thinking. We have to think realistically without losing our own ideals and our cultural foundations. How can we change the present reality, step by step, in the direction of the ideals we strive for? On the whole, the developing Asian nations could well take as an example the way in which Japan, in the past, took possession of Western science and culture without throwing away her own culture. As I said, some moments ago, we should not adopt, but rather adapt Western culture.

The Asian nations who want to develop should first draw up a plan, such as, for example, a five-year plan. This five-year plan should embody an integration of economic, political, social, and cultural developments. Economics and education have to go hand in hand, since it is an impossibility to develop the economy without pushing education.

Economic development should start with the most urgent requirement of the population, namely, an increase in the production of food stuffs. To achieve that goal, it is necessary to bring about a development in the area of the infrastructure and in the production of needed fertilizers. Then come the means of transportation

that run parallel to economic development. Besides having a food production plan, it is also necessary to have a plan with regard to the production of clothing, of building materials, and of medicines made from natural resources present in the country itself.

As mentioned earlier, the educational field has to be correlated with the development of the state and the people. Education is not only needed in economic, technological, and social areas, but also – even more urgently – in the field of politics. A planned political education is very much needed to provide a democratic basis for government administration.

There are very many leaders of Asian peoples who are strongly in favor of true democracy. However, they often forget that Western democracy cannot simply be transplanted into the Asian world. The people in those countries, who are to carry out democracy, do not yet know democracy. They have lived too long under the yokes of feudalism and colonialism. Democracy requires an understanding of responsibility, and the masses of Asia have never carried responsibility; they only know how to obey orders. Therefore, democracy should start off with teaching the people how to carry it out and be responsible for it. Western democracy itself is in a state of transition. True democracy is democracy in the political, economic, and social fields. In a planned educational system the people should be trained step by step to bring about democracy in theory as well as in practice.

Development on the basis of consecutive five-year plans is the only way to develop the Asian nations in a changing world. Planned work will make serious oppositions within the country disappear, and it will give foreign countries enough confidence to grant the necessary assistance.

We Asian nations have great expectations for a closer interrelationship between ourselves. These expectations, however, have proved difficult to materialize in the proper way. When, however, industrial development has made some progress, then it will be possible to start implementing these ideas little by little. Although it may seem paradoxical, it is a fact that a harmonious interrelationship is possible once industrialization has started. The reason is that industrial production makes it possible to produce all sorts of exchangeable goods. The production of agrarian goods has limited potential for interrelationship; for the most part these goods are exchanged with industrial countries.

In the meantime the relationships between Asian countries can

be nurtured by reciprocal appreciation of each others' culture. Such a reciprocal appreciation of each others' culture is an excellent starting point for a strengthening of the network of relations between nations.

Paper read at the Regional Conference of the Association for Asian Studies in Honolulu on June 12, 1968.

50 Islam, knowledge and society

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As I stand here to say a few words to you, I address myself especially to the undergraduates of this university.

I would like to ask you why you have chosen to come here to study. It is certain that it is not entirely for the pursuit of knowledge, because all the subjects found in the curriculum here may be studied elsewhere, at other universities. When you enrol yourself in this Islamic University, it can be said with certainty that you have the desire to prosecute your studies on the basis of the Islamic conception of life.

One may well ask: 'Should not a distinction be made between knowledge and religion?' Indeed, knowledge and religion have different objectives, each one having a different territory in which to operate. Knowledge and faith are two separate aspects of man's consciousness. The lamp of knowledge burns in the *mind*, while the light of religion is situated in the *heart*.

Knowledge explains a problem within the framework of cause and effect. Knowledge probes the causal connection among problems of the same nature. The truth obtained through the explanation knowledge provides is true so long as the premise upon which it is based is true. For that reason the explanation given by knowledge is *relative* in its nature. Scholars always cast a critical glance upon each truth arrived at by research. A critical attitude is part and parcel of the nature of knowledge. That is what makes knowledge progress. It may be said that knowledge begins by striking an attitude of disbelief.

Religion, on the other hand, begins with faith. It accepts any Truth without wanting to dispute it. Religious truth is *absolute* in nature. Belief is the beginning and final goal of religion. Religion in its fundamental sense, seeks unity of mankind in a spirit of brotherhood. It puts forward the normative – i.e. the imperative, *as*

it must. The objective of religion is to give man, both as an individual and as a member of society, a basis for existence to enable him to do what is true, good, just, honest and pure so that there will be tranquillity in the lives of men and people.

But, although religion has its own domain, separate from that of knowledge, religion provides the data, i.e. *facts and figures* for knowledge. In the same way as knowledge that is understood strengthens religious belief, similarly faith in religion will strengthen belief in knowledge in the pursuit of its ideals. Knowledge, too, is really sought for the safety and blessings it will bring to man's terrestrial life. Over the ages scholars have made enormous sacrifices to secure knowledge for the sake of security in man's material existence and for the improvement of the society. And the strength to sacrifice often comes from determination and religious conviction. You will remember that Albert Einstein says in his book *Out of My Later Years*:

'Now, even though the realms of religion and science in themselves are clearly marked off from each other, nevertheless there exist between the two, strong reciprocal relationships and dependencies. Though religion may be that which determines the goal, it has, nevertheless, learned from science, in the broadest sense, what means will contribute to the attainment of the goals it has set up. But science can only be created by those who are thoroughly imbued with the aspiration towards truth and understanding. This source of feeling, however, springs from the sphere of religion. To this there also belongs the faith in the possibility that the regulations valid for the world of existence are rational, that is, comprehensible to reason. I cannot conceive of a genuine scientist without profound faith. The situation may be expressed by an image: Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.'

It is now clear that knowledge is not sought purely in order just to know, to satisfy the desire for learning. Knowledge is sought for the security and improvement of man's existence in this world. As members of society, scholars are responsible – at the very least feel their responsibility – for whether society is in a good or bad state.

Indeed history tells of times when people devoted themselves to learning purely to know and without expecting any profit from it. For example, in ancient Greece great thinkers wrestled with various problems they saw in the world around them. Face to face continuously with a universe so wide, which at night was filled with beauty

and wonder, these Greek thinkers felt the urge to solve the mysteries of the heavens. Their minds were captivated by the recurring rhythm in the revolution of the stars, the sun and the moon. There arose in their minds the question: What is there behind these well regulated movements of the heavenly bodies? Is there some law which exercises control over the universe? Then there rose the question in their minds: From where did the universe come? How did it come into existence, How does it progress and how far will it reach? These questions led men to think of the problem of causation, the connection between cause and effect. Everything that comes into existence has a cause and a continuation. In this connection, two problems of theory arose. Does the connection between cause and effect take place along a straight line, or do cause, the state of being and continuation take place in a position of conflict, according to the rule of dialectics? In this way for hundreds of years the great universe became a problem and a question that absorbed the attention of Greek thinkers.

There is a story about Greece's first philosopher, *Thales*. He liked very much to keep away from people, and he found pleasure in contemplating the problem of the universe and in trying to find out information about the final cause of everything that exists. One fine day while he was walking with his eyes turned upwards observing the beauty of the heavens, he fell into a hole. An old woman who was passing by laughed at him and said: 'Oh Thales, you know how to find your way about in the heavens but you do not know in which direction you are heading on earth'.

However, it was only for some time that the Greeks tackled the problems of the universe purely from the point of view of knowledge. As time went on they utilized their knowledge of the universe and its laws to improve their living conditions upon the earth. From the theoretical knowledge which they sought thus far, there emerged applied science.

Later on Greek thinkers discovered that, besides the large Universe that was around them, there was a *small universe* inside them. They could not see this universe with their eyes but they could feel its existence. Then arose the question in their mind: why was I born? what are the obligations life imposes upon me? What should my outlook on life be and what should I do to secure well-being? With this awareness man began to face up to the question of *ethics*.

Since the time ethics became to influence human thought, man could no longer pursue knowledge purely for the acquisition of

knowledge. The knowledge they gathered they utilised for bettering their condition. Knowledge became an important weapon in their struggle for existence and to achieve better living conditions.

The history of knowledge of the universe and of technology clearly demonstrates the extent of their influence upon the progress of society from one period to another. Technological discoveries were speedily utilised by man to perfect production and the means of communication on sea and on land, and later in the air. We see how a technological revolution is quickly followed by a revolution in industry, transportation and distribution. We are now entering an age often termed the 'century of the atom'. Further progress in knowledge about the atom gives one a sense of fear because the very first time the atom was used was for destructive purposes. But now there is the consciousness that the nuclear energy should be put to use for the needs of civilisation, to intensify industrial production of many kinds and to obtain an improvement in social security. Of course, there are those who seek knowledge for the sake of advancing knowledge, but alongside this we see efforts to utilise that knowledge in a practical manner. Knowledge is utilised to obtain a betterment in man's worldly life that is far from perfect.

Now arises the question: What is Islam's contribution in this matter?

Islam is a religion, not a science. As a religion it cannot directly give content to knowledge. Islam's contribution to knowledge is found in its exhortations to its followers to acquire knowledge as much as possible and wherever possible and from whomsoever possible. Muslims are under obligation to seek a noble existence and a high status and to achieve these, the acquisition of knowledge is a necessity. That is why the pursuit of learning is compulsory – in the words of Sheikh Muhammad Abduh – 'in all places and should be welcomed from any mouth'. The religion of the person from whom knowledge is sought is no problem because what should be kept in mind is his skill and command of knowledge. The Prophet (Peace be on Him) has said: *Alhikmatu dhaallatul mukminin faman wadjadaha fahua ahaqqu biha*, which interpreted means: 'Knowledge is the objective of a faithful, and it is most right to welcome it wherever it is found'.

There is no narrow outlook in Islam, as the Prophet's words show. Every religion has suffered at the hands of irresponsible fanatics. So has Islam; but Islam has the capacity and the willingness to get along with other religions. Islam preaches resignation to God's will:

and how can man be at peace with his Maker before he has achieved peace with his fellow-men, whatever their religious beliefs? This is one aspect of Islam not so well understood but, nevertheless, tolerance in the highest degree is compulsory for every Muslim.

This history of Islam proves that for centuries and centuries Islam was a strong factor in the dissemination of knowledge. Muslim scholars of bygone days gave new life to the wisdom of the Greeks that remained discarded in the Middle Ages, and these scholars spread it to Europe through Asia Minor, North Africa and Spain. Remnants of the Islamic culture established in Spain can still be seen in the Catholic Spain of today. Had it not been for the propulsive force of Islam, it would not have been possible for a people such as the Arabs – backward in everything including civilisation and culture – to have become in so short a time the repository and disseminators of knowledge.

The source of their activities is the fact that Islam does not circumscribe their works and deeds to matters concerning the hereafter only. Islam is for this world and the next. Islam not only calls for the performance of religious obligations, not only does it not limit its followers to the worship of God alone, but it also lays upon them the obligation to arrange their worldly affairs in the best possible manner. Allah says in he *Quran: 'Wabtaghi fima aataakallahud-daaral aachirata wala tansa naciebaka minad dunia, waahsin kama ahsanallahu ilaika walaa tabghil fasaada fil ardhi innallaha laa juhibbul mufsidien,* which means: 'Seek the hereafter, but while doing so do not be forgetful of your lot on this earth. Do good in the same way as Allah is good to you and do no evil on this earth for the Lord hates evil-doers.'

As you know, the word Islam means peace, peace not only in the performance of religious obligations but also in the words of greeting! Peace unto all mankind. And peace is the highest law in Islam. For real and living justice will only be achieved when the mind of each individual is quiet and peaceful and his soul is governed by the feeling of peace towards his own condition and the world around him. Only a world at peace on the basis of brotherhood among all peoples can usher in the welfare and prosperity of the masses.

In truth the teachings of Islam are the teaching of peace. We direct our religious obligations, performed with deep conscious knowledge, to Allah, the one and mighty God, Lord of the entire universe. We recite our five daily prayers with a clean countenance and a pure soul because it is only in such a state that we can be face

to face with Allah – He to whom we bare the contents of our soul, He whose greatness we continuously exalt with the words Allahu Akbar. When we are to come into the presence of Allah, our mind should be pure, free from all evil feelings and bad intentions, and free from anger. All this is illustrated in the manner in which we take water for the ablution before prayer as laid down in religion. Although the body is clean after a bath, nevertheless parts of the body are again washed, in order that the mouth be untainted by evil words, the face clean as a mirror of the mind, the hands unsullied by not holding things unclean, the ears unpolluted by calumny and incitements and that which is not good, the clear brow shining like the clear heart inside, the feet clean to denote that they have not strayed from the straight path. We end our prayers by saying 'assalumu' alaikum' to right and to left, expressing peace towards all and to the whole world.

Every day, at fixed intervals, we train ourselves to overcome our passions and to control ourselves in order that we may plant in our soul the feelings of purity and nobility. Unfortunately however, we do not always realise what we have done. Often we carry out our religious obligations in automatic fashion and forget that we are performing a spiritual and physical exercise in the presence of the one and mighty God. It is therefore useful, from time to time, to ponder with deep consciousness, how clear and explicit is the guidance Islam gives us.

Islam guides us to the road of peace, teaches us to be patient, but wants these things done on the basis of *truth* and *justice*, because only truth and justice can create an atmosphere of peace. For that reason we should seek truth which is also the first objective of knowledge, and the quest for justice is the prime duty of the faithful

All that is good and pure is not easily obtained in this imperfect world. All this has to be struggled for, and a struggle calls for *courage*. Courage faces many difficulties but courage knows how to bear suffering and sacrifice for victory of one's ideals.

In this, too, Islam gives guidance.

The basis of courage is to be found in faith. The fundamentals of the Islamic faith give us the wherewithal to struggle for the quest of truth and justice. Faith in the one and mighty God who is the prime mover of all things, 'He who does not beget and was not begotten, and He who has no equal' – this faith by itself creates a feeling of courage in the minds of Muslims. It is only Allah whom Muslims fear; it is only to Allah that the Muslim bares his soul.

The Muslim resigns himself to the one and mighty God and fears no one but Allah. From God come truth and justice, and for that reason Muslims who conduct the struggle along God's path never feel fear or loneliness wherever they may be. They feel it in their hearts that God is always beside them, guiding and protecting them. Throughout the ages, the warriors and sages of Islam have drawn their strength from resignation to Allah.

The Muslim will find in all sections of the *Quran* the duties he must fulfil during his lifetime. As I have already stated, Islam not only lays down what should be done in the way of religious obligation and the practice of good works, but it also regulates how man has to behave in his daily contacts, determines his rights and duties as a member of society and as a citizen of the country to which he belongs. Indeed, Islam even determines the basis of the administration of the state– the principle of *taking counsel together.* The *Quran* contains the basis of democratic government. The method of translating that democratic government into practice is left to wise men, and they obtain their wisdom as a gift of God. With the wisdom God has given them, men should to the very best degree, carry out the government of the state and the structure of society, so that all men, including the faithful, may enjoy the blessings of God. Man should at all times render thanks to Allah, God of the entire universe, for making his life pleasant. So that each person knows how to be thankful, he should live a proper life upon this earth. It is the task of every Muslim to bring into being a society which will ensure to each of its members security and the good things of life.

The task and the duty of a Muslim are to be found all over the *Quran*, written in various verses. All these are details of the fundamental subject embodied in the surat *Al-Fatihah*, the first chapter of the *Quran.* The surat Al-Fatihah is the core of the Holy *Quran.* Muslims who perform the religious obligations read Al-Fatihah no less than 17 times a day. He who fully understands the contents and real meaning of this chapter of the *Quran* will find in it a guide to what life's objective should be, how to struggle in accordance with God's precept and from what source he will derive strength for the struggle.

All of you know the contents of the surat *Al-Fatihah.* Nevertheless, in order to make my talk more complete I cite a translation in English by *Sir Richard Burton*, an excerpt from *The Koran* translated by George Sale:

In the Name of Allah, the Merciful, the Compassionate!
Praise be to Allah, who the three worlds made.
The Merciful, the Compassionate.
The King of the Day of Fate.
Thee *alone* do we worship,
  and of Thee *alone* do we ask aid.
Guide us to the path that is straight.
The path of those to whom Thy love is great
Not those in whom is hate,
Nor they that deviate.

How great is the moving of the spirit *Al-Fatihah* arouses in the Muslim! He worships one God, namely Allah. He does not worship God because of fear but through love. The God of the Muslim is loving and compassionate in nature. He is the judge in the hereafter. This means that the God of the Muslim is Just. It is to this God, loving, compassionate and just, that the Muslim asks for help, requests guidance to keep him on the straight road of truth and justice blessed by the Lord.

The carrying out of religious obligations and the acts of Muslims in this world should be in harmony with the attributes of the one and mighty God whom they praise – loving, compassionate, just and with feet planted firmly on the road of truth. If there is no intention of putting these into practice, what meaning is there in those fulsome praises directed to the presence of Allah? God lacks nothing, neither greatness nor honour, because He is an entity complete in every sense. Therefore all praise directed to Almighty God implies readiness to put it into practice in this transient world.

Brotherliness is the manifestation of the qualities of love and compassion, the spirit of brotherhood between people of one race and peoples of all other races. However big the differences in opinion between one person and another, or between one party and another over various day-to-day problems, the unity of race will be preserved and the feeling of brotherhood will hold sway. Further, the aim should be brotherly relations among all nations. It is only on the basis of brotherhood that we can achieve peace and harmony in international dealings.

However, on the other hand, it is evident that brotherhood is only possible among people on the same level. There cannot be real brotherhood between master and slave, or between the oppressor and the oppressed. The feelings of brotherhood cannot be forced

upon someone: it should spring from a pure mind as a reaction to the way one is treated. In order to achieve a sound footing for the brotherhood of all the nations of the world, it is necessary first to do away with the system of imperialism and colonialism which gives rise to the oppression of one race by another and thereby obstructs the cultural and economic progress of the oppressed.

The manifestation in our daily lives of that nature of *God which makes Him the most just* and Judge in the hereafter lies in the way we practise justice. In all our actions we should adopt a *just* attitude, we should have love of justice and we should be willing to stand up for justice in this world. And the upholding of justice will include the demand that *social justice* shall be the basis for social intercourse between man and man and between nation and nation throughout the world.

The peace sought by Islam will only be achieved when the international world becomes a perfect structure founded on law – not the law imposed by the strong upon the weak (for that is in truth violation) but law emanating from the profoundest source and manifesting itself on earth as the fruit of counsel taken together among all peoples. And as I have already reminded you the highest form of law according to Islam is peace. And the law which springs from counsel taken in an atmosphere of peace from coercion is the highest form of justice man can achieve. On this foundation the world can become peaceful and secure, and the nations of the world will feel that they live under the aegis of laws that are just.

Before there are laws that are binding upon and control the actions of each nation towards others, there can be no perfection in the laws of the world. And we shall not be in a position to secure what was put forward by the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt of the United States as the third freedom which became a slogan in the Second World War, namely, *freedom from fear.*

What he put forward as the basis of a new world does not differ from what Islam wants. The feeling for peace will only find its way into men's souls when they are freed from fear and when all around them they see law and justice. On this account Muslims from all countries are under the obligation to struggle for the achievement of *legal* justice and *social* justice throughout the world.

Social justice will not have been secured in a society when its condition reveals a sharp clash between rich and poor, when prosperity is not evenly spread throughout all layers of society. It is only when man is released from the vicissitudes of existence and

can feel freedom from want that social justice will become a reality. The sources of production within each country should be mobilised to ensure the achievement of welfare for the whole population.

One means of achieving social justice is through the *cooperative movement* which gives rise to joint endeavours on a basis of mutual help. Cooperative organisations are truly in keeping with the ideals of Islam because Islam places upon the individual the responsibility for the well-being of the entire community. Further, in order to secure social security in accordance with Islam, the state should represent a welfare state which guarantees the prosperity of all. And not only material prosperity but also, chiefly, spiritual wealth. Man will always feel poor when he does not participate in the development of culture. Material welfare will only be achieved when there is a balance between wealth, material and the spiritual. And that balance will be achieved only when the call of religion is sufficiently influential on society.

Science, especially physics and technology, has achieved such a stage of progress that, unless checked by religion, it can easily become a most frightful demon. Listen to the cry of soul of a great man of science such as Albert Einstein[1] regarding the progress of the very knowledge he in such big part helped:

'By painful experience we have learnt that rational thinking does not suffice to solve the problems of our social life. Penetrating research and keen scientific work have often had tragic implications for mankind, producing, on the one hand, inventions which liberated man from exhausting physical labour, making this life easier and richer; but on other hand, introducing a grave restlessness into his life, making him a slave to his technological *environment,* and – most catastrophic of all – creating the means for his own mass destruction. This, indeed, is a tragedy of overwhelming poignancy!

However poignant that tragedy is, it is perhaps even more tragic that, while mankind has produced many scholars so extremely successful in the field of science and technology, we have been for a long time so inefficient in finding adequate solutions to the many political conflicts and economic tensions which beset us. No doubt, the antagonism of economic interests within and among nations is largely responsible to a great extent for the dangerous and threatening condition in the world today. Man has not succeeded in developing political and economic forms of organization which would guarantee the peaceful coexistence of the nations of the world. He

has not succeeded in building the kind of system which would eliminate the possibility of war and banish forever the murderous instruments of mass destruction.'

Those were Albert Einstein's words. His clear statement shows that *thought* which produces knowledge should be controlled by a *mind* filled with religious feeling which gives an ethical basis to the use of the findings of knowledge in everyday life. The objectives of knowledge should run parallel with those of religion in the achievement of man's welfare. Knowledge is a tool: its objective is spiritual and material well-being.

Such is the case with the state as a social organisation. A state is not an end in itself but an instrument to achieve blessedness, peace and freedom for the people. It is not the people for the state, but the state for the people.

These are also the ideals of Islam. The world and the universe around it do not belong to man but to Allah, God of the entire universe. It is God who created this universe and made the world as a dwelling for man. Man's position in this world is not that of a proprietor but of a steward who is responsible for its continued safety. Therefore it is the duty of man who inhabits Allah's world to preserve it well and hand it over, in better condition than he received it from his forbears, to his descendants.

This is the Islamic principle of life.

You who come to study in this Islamic University should base your pursuit of knowledge on the Islamic principles. Naturally, the logic contained in knowledge does not change, but the use to which knowledge is desired to be put should be in harmony with *Islamic Ethics*.

When you study physics here, do it in such a way that your knowledge can eventually be utilised to lessen man's burdens in this imperfect world. And not only that. All that is in your heart and mind should be unsparingly used to wage a struggle against the evil instincts and predatory nature of man's attempt to use knowledge to manufacture 'murderous instruments of mass destruction'.

When you study law or politics or economics here – any of the social subjects – use that knowledge to create a society and state that will ensure social justice and brotherliness, not only among the people of one particular country but all over the world. I cannot agree with all of what Iqbal said, but one truth he mentioned should form part of my talk to you. 'Islam is neither nationalism nor imperialism but a league of nations, which recognizes artificial

boundaries and racial distinctions for facility of reference only, and not for restricting the social horizon of its members.'[2]

A Muslim has Allah in mind in all his deeds and acts. Similarly that should be your attitude towards your studies. Also knowledge calls for self-sacrifice from he who seeks it, because it is only through sacrifice that progress comes. A famous sociologist – indeed the foremost at the beginning of this century – named Max Weber says in this regard:[3]

'In science, each of us knows that what he has accomplished will be antiquated in ten, twenty, fifty years. That is the fate to which science is subjected; it is the very meaning of scientific work, to which it is devoted in a quite specific sense, as compared with other spheres of culture for which in general the same holds. Every scientific fulfilment raises new "questions"; it *asks* to be "surpassed" and outdated. Whoever wishes to serve science has to resign himself to this fact. Scientific works certainly can last as "gratifications" because of their artistic quality, or they may remain important as a means of training. Yet they will be surpassed scientifically – let that be repeated – for it is our common fate and, more, our common goal. We cannot work without hoping that others will advance further than we have. In principle, his process goes on *ad infinitum.*'

I would like you to keep that truth in the fore-front of *your minds* for it comes as the fruit of personal experience from one of the greatest writers.

And now I have come to the end of my talk, and I thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the patience with which you have listened to me.

Speech, held at Aligarh University, India,
on October 29th, 1955.

1. *Out of My Later Years*, p. 152.
2. Dr. M. Aziz Ahmad c.s., *Iqbal as a Thinker*, p. 267.
3. From Max Weber, *Essays in Sociology*, 'Science as a Vocation', p. 138.

Date Due

JAN 2 [illegible]
FEB 0 8 1995
FEB 1 3 1995
JAN 1 6 2012

DS 644.1 .H38 A26
Hatta, Mohammad, 1902-
Portrait of a patriot; selecte
010101 000
0 1163 0093224 5
TRENT UNIVERSITY

DS644.1 .H38A26
Hatta, Mohammad
Portrait of a patriot.

DATE	ISSUED TO

245788